NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

AN INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY FOR
NEW TESTAMENT AND RELATED STUDIES
BASED ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Vol. IV 1960 Fasc. 1

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

THE LEGAL BACKGROUND OF MT. vi 12

BY

F. CHARLES FENSHAM
Stellenbosch, South Africa

To understand the fifth prayer of the Lord's Prayer we must take into account a very ancient legal practice to which it refers. In a very interesting paper recently, J. JEREMIAS argues that Matthew translates the Aramaic word *ḥobha* literally with 'οφείλημα while Luke takes up the secondary meaning of *ḥobha* namely "sin"[1]). It is, however, interesting to compare Mt. vi 12 with Deut. xv 2, especially when we take the LXX into consideration. The law of Deut. xv 2 which is already present in Ex. xxii 25, stands in sharp contrast to the common legal practices of the Ancient Near East. All over the Near East the law prevailed that a creditor had the right to take his debtor or his family into slavery. [2]) This common law was not unknown in New Testament times according to Sifra Lev. 25 : 39 (55c 35). [3]) It is even true that from the earliest times on, eg. in the Covenant Code, on the one hand an Israelite was forbidden to be a creditor to his kinsman, and on the other hand this practice took place and laws were made to protect the rights of the credit-slave (cf. Ex. xxi 1-6 with Ex. xxii 25). [4]) The barbaric law of credit-slaves was upheld in the time of Jeremiah (Jer. xxxiv 8). [5]) It is also obvious from the above-mentioned source that it was practised in New Testament times. Is it not possible that Christ referred to this practice in the second part of the fifth prayer? The close parallel between the Greek of Mt. vi 12 and that of LXX at Deut. xv 2 is not to be disregarded. Both the keywords of these two texts

[1]) J. JEREMIAS, *The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research, ET.*, Feb. 1960, p. 143.

[2]) Cf. *CH.* 117-118, P. KOSCHAKER, *Quellenkritische Untersuchungen zu altassyrischen Gesetze*, 1921, p. 66; D. J. WISEMAN, *The Alalakh Tablets*, 1953, p. 46 to call a few instances to mind.

[3]) J. JEREMIAS, *Jerusalem*, Teil II B, p. 185.

[4]) See a forthcoming paper *Some Legal Aspects in Samuel* in *Die Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap van Suid-Afrika.*

[5]) Cf. M. DAVID, *The Manumission of Slaves under Zedekiah, OTS.*, 1948, pp. 63 ff.

are the same, *eg.* 'αφήσαις in Deuteronomy with 'άφας [1]) and 'αφήκαμεν in Matthew, 'οφείλει in Deuteronomy with 'οφειλήματα in [2]) Matthew. It is possible that Matthew had Deut. xv 2 in mind while giving the fifth prayer. The fact of the creditor-debtor position in this prayer is stressed by various scholars, *eg.* A. Schlatter [3]) and T. Zahn. [4])

To fill in the background of this prayer we may turn to the sect of Qumrân. According to our argument the second part of the fifth prayer is directed against credit-slavery. Is there any evidence from the time of Christ of a similar attitude? In an illuminating study L. Rost points out that it was impossible for a member of the sect to possess slaves, because he had to deliver all his possessions to the community (יחד). [5]) In spite of the fact that the references of Philo to the Essenes may not be reliable, [6]) it is, however interesting to note that he refers to the fact that the sect was against slavery. [7]) The only problem with this assumption is that in the Zadokite Documents references are made to the possession of slaves. [8]) This is in marked contrast to the common background of the Qumrân sect. Elliger is correct when he suggests that the poor formed the great majority of the sect. [9]) To be poor and one of "the people of the land" was the common ideal, and not to have possessions. These peoples were in danger of becoming slaves and not to make slaves as creditors. This is also exactly the background of the fifth prayer. God as our creditor can take us into slavery, but Jesus has paid our debts. Through Jesus sake our debts are forgiven and we are called on to do the same with our debtors. The background of this is the hard facts of life, but Jesus brought these facts in connexion with spiritual needs. [10])

---

[1]) I think that the close parallel testifies against the standpoint of E. Lohmeyer of the cultic use of ἀφιέναι. Cf. Lohmeyer, *Das Vater-Unser*, p. 113.

[2]) Cf. Moulton-Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, p. 468 were ὀφειλή is attested in the papyri with the meaning "debt".

[3]) A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist das Matthäus*, 1948, p. 213.

[4]) T. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*, 1910, pp. 284 ff.

[5]) L. Rost, *Zur Struktur der Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus*, *VT.*, IX, pp. 296 ff.

[6]) Cf. F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 1958, p. 55.

[7]) Cf. W. Bousset-H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 1926, p. 458.

[8]) Cf. XI : 12, XII : 11. Cf. C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, 1958, pp. 57, 61.

[9]) K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, 1953, p. 222.

[10]) Cf. also Hauck, *TWBNT*, V, p. 562.

MATTHEW xxvi 52 — A QUOTATION FROM THE TARGUM

BY

HANS KOSMALA
Jerusalem, Israel

It seems to be generally agreed that the saying of Jesus: "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Mt xxvi 52 only) is a proverb presumably based on Gen ix 6 and the *ius talionis* (W. Bousset, B. Weiss, A. Loisy). A reference to the same proverb is also seen in Apoc xiii 10 (according to the traditional understanding of the text; but cf. the comment of E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 1926, p. 110). Mt xxvi 52 has been linked also with other passages of the NT, such as Mt v 39 and Rom xii 18 f., as well as with statements of the Church Fathers (Tertullian, *Apolog.* 37; Origines, *Mt comm ser lat* 102), and it has been pointed out that using the sword in defence of one's own rights is contrary to the spirit of Christ and early Christianity (J. Weiss, E. Klostermann). It goes without saying that it has been quoted by all advocates of a Christian doctrine of pacifism.

Such comments and conclusions, however, do not really elucidate the meaning of the words of Jesus. They were spoken in particular circumstances. There is no proof that the saying was already a proverb at that time, although it may be true to say that it became a proverb afterwards. As the particle γάρ, with which the sentence begins, introduces the reason for the demand to put the sword back into its place, it is not very likely that Jesus should avail himself here only of popular wisdom expressed in a proverb. There must be some greater authority behind his demand.

The saying is, indeed, a quotation from an Aramaic version of Is l 11. Strack-Billerbeck, G. Dalman, and M. Black do not seem to have noticed it. The MT of Is l 11 reads:

> Behold, all you (that) kindle a fire, (that) are armed with firebrands: walk in (or: go into) the flame of your fire and in(to) the firebrands you have lighted. From my hand you have this: you shall lie down in torment.

The Targum gives a paraphrase using another parallelism (fire-sword):

Behold, all you (that) kindle a fire, (that) take a sword: go, fall into the fire which you have kindled, and into (or: by) the sword which you have taken. From my Memra you have this: you shall return to your destruction.

Mt xxvi 52 uses only those words which apply to the situation: *kul(kon)* . . . *mᵉtaqqᵉpej ḫᵃrab* . . . (*pulu*) . . . *baḫrab* . . . *lᵉtaqlatᵉkon* (*tᵉtubun*).

The *mᵉtaqqᵉpej ḫᵃrab* are those who take the sword. *Tᵉqalta'* is "destruction" (s. DALMAN, *Handwörterbuch* 447a; the shorter form *taqla'* = Hebrew *moqeš* usually means "snare", or "stumbling-block", but very often includes also the final result: "calamity", "misery", "destruction"; cf. TO Ex x 7; xxiii 33; TO Dt vii 16). The Greek translation of the Aramaic sentence transformed into a general statement (3rd p. pl.) would be as follows (cf. LXX Ez xxx 17):

πάντες . . . οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν . . . (πεσοῦνται) . . . ἐν μαχαίρῃ . . . (ἐπιστρέψουσιν) εἰς τὴν (ἑαυτῶν) ἀπώλειαν.

Mt xxvi 52 reads:

πάντες οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν, ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀπολοῦνται.

The correspondence of the two sentences is in the first part literal, whilst the second part appears contracted in the NT. Mt xxvi 52 is a clear reference to the Aramaic paraphrase of Is l 11 and is, therefore, not a simple proverbialism, but implies the divine verdict: "From my hand (= Memra) you have this." To recall merely a common proverb to the memory of his disciples would certainly not have done. Jesus reminded them of God's will as revealed in the Scriptures, which had a special meaning for this time of the end and in this situation in particular. We must understand the quotation with its full eschatological implications. The emphasis of xxvi 54, that the Scriptures must come to pass, is, therefore, valid with special regard to verse 52. Some scholars (like E. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, 1927², p. 213) think, that verse 56a is a duplicate. This is not the case. The high-priests and elders had sent out their servants with *swords* and cudgels, and to them also apply "the Scriptures and the Prophets" (incidentally the plural is also used in Targ Is l 10), again with reference to the quotation in Mt xxvi 52. Luke xxii 53b has a different conclusion to the story, but it points to the same end: ". . . but this is *your* hour and the power of darkness".

One more point should here be noted. According to Targ Is l 11 God says: "you shall return to your destruction". Why return? One returns to the place or sphere to which one belongs. *Teqalta'* must, then, be understood as the sphere where "destruction" is the reigning power. The word appears here in the same sense in which the Greek equivalent ἀπώλεια is also often used in the NT (Apoc xvii 8 is an excellent example). It is noteworthy that Mt xxvi 52 prefers ἀπολοῦνται to πεσοῦνται (cf. also the eschatological meaning of the verb ἀπόλλυσθαι in many passages of the NT).

QUMRAN AND THE ORIGIN OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

BY

HOWARD M. TEEPLE
Buckhannon, W. Va. U.S.A.

I

One theory concerning the parallels between the Dead Sea scrolls and the Fourth Gospel is that they indicate that many or all of the traditions in that Gospel are authentic. W. F. ALBRIGHT concluded that "the books of the Essenes from the first century B. C. provide the closest approach to the Gospels (particularly St. John) and the Pauline Epistles, so far as conceptual background and terminology are concerned, that has yet been discovered" and that they show that "both narratives and *logia* of John's Gospel certainly or presumably date back to oral tradition in Palestine, before A.D. 70; they were probably transmitted orally in the Diaspora for at least a decade—possibly two decades—before being put into writing. . . . That the needs of the early Church influenced the selection of items for inclusion in the Gospel we may readily admit, but there is no reason to suppose that the needs of that Church were responsible for any inventions or innovations of theological significance. . . . we may rest assured that it [the Gospel of John] contains the memories of the Apostle John . . . '[1])

Frank M. CROSS, Jr., after examining the parallels of the Fourth Gospel with Qumran literature, apparently favors a similar con-

---

[1]) W. F. ALBRIGHT, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John," in W. D. DAVIES and D. DAUBE, eds., *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, Cambridge, England 1956, pp. 169-71. Professor ALBRIGHT previously had claimed that John's substratum was orally transmitted Aramaic tradition (*The Archaeology of Palestine*, pp. 240, 248) and that there are some "illustrations of the accuracy of local colouring in John, which clearly indicates that these traditions were put into substantially their extant form before A. D. 66-70" (*ibid.*, p. 244). As the scrolls from Qumran became known, Albright employed them to support his conviction that the tradition in John is early and authentic.

clusion: "We must look for a Sitz im Leben for the development of Johannine tradition where Jewish Christianity was dominant, and where Essene influences persisted. Some have suggested that John may be regarded no longer as the latest and most evolved of the Gospels, but the most primitive, and that the formative locus of its tradition was Jerusalem before its destruction. This is not to suggest that the present form of the book has not had an elaborate literary history; the point is that John preserves authentic historical material which first took form in an Aramaic or Hebrew milieu where Essene currents still ran strong." [1])

Kurt SCHUBERT, too, views the Qumran scrolls as decisive support for a conservative conclusion concerning the origin of the Fourth Gospel. "Thus one of the most important results of Qumran research has been to prove the Jewish origin of the Gospel of John conclusively." [2]) "The similarities in style between the Gospel of John and the Qumran texts are so striking that a close connection cannot be denied." [3])

Criticism of such views has been steadily mounting. In 1957 Frederick C. GRANT made this comment: "The theory that, in view of certain parallels found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the [Fourth] gospel must have been written in Palestine, preferably southern Palestine, and at a fairly early date, perhaps shortly before or after the Fall of Jerusalem, and by an apostle, presumably John the son of Zebedee, is surely an example of the wish fathering the thought. Included in the vast array of parallels found in Hellenistic religious literature, especially Greek, Egyptian and Near Eastern. . ., the few which are found in the Dead Sea Scrolls are really minor and only 'more of the same.' They simply testify to the widespread religious syncretism which existed in that period and influenced the most diverse types of religious life and thought, even Jewish, even Essene—or 'sectarian Jewish'—especially in their religious imagery. [4])

Millar BURROWS criticizes Professor ALBRIGHT's position and comments: "How much in the Gospel of John comes from Jesus and

---

[1]) Frank Moore CROSS, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, London 1958, pp. 161-2.

[2]) Kurt SCHUBERT, *The Dead Sea Community: the Background to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, New York 1959, p. 152.

[3]) *Ibid.*, p. 153.

[4]) Frederick C. GRANT, *The Gospels: Their Origin and Growth*, New York 1957, p. 175.

how much from the evangelist himself is a difficult question which cannot be answered by parallels with the Dead Sea scrolls. It is somewhat confusing also to be told that the Synoptics and John differ especially at the points of closest resemblance with Essene teaching, and at the same time that the parallels with the scrolls in the Synoptic Gospels are in the areas of closest agreement with John." [1])

Recently Cyril BLACKMAN has observed: "... what appears to have been taken over by Christians from the Qumran stock of ideas may simply derive from contemporary Judaism or from the original common source in the Old Testament, just as parallels with Qumran ideas in Mandaean sources may not imply direct borrowing but only an ultimate derivation from the Old Testament or from Iranian dualism." [2])

If the scrolls really indicate that the traditions in the Fourth Gospel are early in origin, it must be demonstrated that these traditions contain features derived from the Palestinian Essene background rather than from other environments. What methods should be employed to solve this problem? At the outset the Johannine Epistles should be separated from the Gospel of John, for the old view that all were written by the same author is not supported by the evidence. The inclusion or exclusion of these Epistles, however, does not change the conclusions of this study.

Features in the scrolls but not in the Fourth Gospel

One approach to the problem is to note the differences between the scrolls and John. Some differences are to be expected, but differences in *basic* features constitute evidence against a close relationship between the two. One group of differences consists of characteristic terms and ideas which are in the scrolls but absent from John. These include the following: a) 'Belial" (בליעל) as the name for the personification of evil (1QS 1 : 18, 24; etc.; 1QM 1 : 1 ff.; etc.); b) belief that the sect has a "new covenant" (הברית החדשה, CD 6 : 19; etc.); c) expectation of an eschatological war (1QM); d) emphasis upon ethics; e) light and darkness are contrasting *spirits* (1QS 3 : 25); f) *both* the good and evil spirits are from God (1QS 3 : 18; contrary to 1 John iv 1); g) hatred of all

[1]) Millar BURROWS, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, New York 1958, p. 129. See also pp. 123-30.

[2]) Cyrill BLACKMAN, "The Critical Quest," *The Christian Century*, vol. 76, p. 1176, Chicago 1959.

outsiders, gentiles included; [1]) h) degrees of rank among the members; [2]) i) necessity of repentance (1QS 10 : 20; CD 2 : 5; 8 : 16; neither μετανοέω nor μετάνοια occur in John); j) revelation as a vital possession of the sect (1QS 9 : 13); k) the spirit of truth is opposed to the spirit of evil (IQS 3 : 19; 4 : 2 ff); l) interpretation of Torah as the primary source of doctrine; [3]) m) the term "saints" (אנשי הקודש, "the men of holiness," 1QS 8 : 23; 9 : 8; cf. CD 20 : 8, קדושי עליון, "saints of the Most High." The Greek equivalents, ἅγιοι and ἡγιασμένοι, are not in the Fourth Gospel); n) the terms "the elect" or "those whom God has chosen" as applied to the religious group (בחירי ישראל, "elect of Israel," CD 4 : 3-4; 1QS 8 : 6; cf. 1QS 4 : 22; 11 : 7, 16; in John the disciples are never the ἐκλογαί or ἐκλεκτοί). Some differences would result from adaptation to the Christian ideas, but would the author have omitted all of these if the background were Essene?

In connection with these features which are absent from the Gospel of John, some further remarks may be made. Not only is the term "Belial" absent, but the characteristic term in that Gospel is the Greek word διάβολος, "devil," and not the Jewish terms "Belial" and σατανᾶς, "Satan." Σατανᾶς occurs only once in John (xiii 27) and this is probably derived from Luke xxiii 3. John never describes the devil in the language employed in the scrolls.

The chief ethical note in John is the commandment to love one another, and this is included not because the author has a general concern for ethics, but because he recognizes the need for unity in a church torn by dissension. In the scrolls, however, the deep concern for ethics constantly appears. The question of ethical dualism will be discussed later.

As for revelation, at Qumran it came through interpretation of the Torah and was the main source of the sect's rules and doctrines, whereas in John Torah is spurned as the Jews' law and is valued only as testimony of Christ. The noun ἀποκάλυψις, "revelation," does not occur in the Fourth Gospel. The verb ἀποκαλύπτω occurs only once (Jn. xii 38); it appears not because it is a term in the

---

[1]) 1QS 1 : 4, 10; however, cf. CD 12 : 6-9. Although John is hostile to the *world*, the author never hates outsiders in general, but only Jews.

[2]) 1QS 3 : 20-3; 4 : 21-4; etc. On the other hand, there is "no indication of a fixed order or rank among the disciples" (Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 126).

[3]) For Qumran's interpretation of Torah see the present writer's monograph, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, Philadelphia 1957, ch. 2.

author's vocabulary, but because it happens to be in a quotation from Isaiah liii 1.

If the Fourth Gospel had been influenced by Qumran, would it have omitted the idea of a new covenant, or at least a covenant, a basic doctrine in the scrolls and in early Christianity as well? Would the author, contrary to Jesus and to Judaism in general, have been so relatively uninterested in ethics? Would he have omitted completely both the word and the doctrine of repentance, which were characteristic of Palestinian Christianity as well as Qumran?

Features in the Fourth Gospel but not in the scrolls

A second group of differences between John and the scrolls consists of characteristic features present in the Gospel and absent from the scrolls. These include: a) the necessity of abiding in the Son of God and in his love (xv 1-8); b) the Messiah as an incarnate god (i 14); c) "Son of Man" as a messianic title (i 51; etc.); d) the doctrine that salvation depends upon eating the flesh and drinking the blood of a god (vi 53-4); e) semi-Gnostic ideas such as knowing the Father (xiii 3), rebirth (iii 3), physical dualism (iii 6), and concern for "whence" and "whither" (iii 8; viii 14; etc.).

The title "Son of Man" occurs thirteen times in the Fourth Gospel. Unless it has been discovered very recently, this messianic title has not been found at Qumran. On the other hand, belief in a Messiah who is a descendant of David was prevalent both at Qumran [1]) and in early Christianity, but it is absent from John, except on Jewish lips (vii 42). If the Fourth Gospel were influenced by Qumran, would its Christology be so radically different?

The sixth chapter of the Gospel of John makes eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man a requirement for salvation. The idea of eating the flesh and drinking the blood of either God or Messiah never occurs in ancient Jewish literature; in fact, such an idea was utterly repugnant to all Judaism, even Hellenistic Judaism. If the Fourth Gospel's background were Palestinian, would it have included such a doctrine?

Helmer RINGREN has pointed out that the sect at Qumran was not Gnostic. [2]) Concerning the Fourth Gospel, Robert M. GRANT has stated: "Even though the Gospel of John is not fully Gnostic,

[1]) I.e., the Son of David. Florilegium; Commentary on Genesis 49.

[2]) "Gnosis i Qumrantexterna," *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*, vol. 24, pp. 41-53, Uppsala 1959.

it remains a fact that in it we find a portrait of Jesus which is essentially mythological." [1]) He observes also that John's language is "semi-Gnostic." [2]) Although the Fourth Gospel is not *fully* Gnostic, it certainly is much closer to Gnosticism than is the Qumran literature. Thus the semi-Gnosticism in John is an element which is absent from the scrolls. The Dead Sea scrolls are dualistic, but not semi-Gnostic.

Alleged parallels

A second approach to the problem of the possible relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the scrolls is to search for and to examine the parallels between them. Some *alleged* parallels, however, are too remote or too general to deserve to be called parallels.

Eschatology is not a significant parallel, for it was very prominent at Qumran, but in the Fourth Gospel it is minimized. John's eschatology lacks the characteristics of that of primitive Christianity. Considering that eschatology was so prevalent in both Judaism and primitive Christianity, is it reasonable to assume that a Gospel which minimizes and reinterprets eschatology has a Palestinian background or presents authentic tradition?

The baptism with the Holy Spirit in John is not a parallel to the role of the spirit in the scrolls, for in the latter the spirit does not cause one to be born from above, but rather causes his sins to be atoned and precedes the "washing" in water which purifies the flesh (1QS 3 : 6-9). [3])

It has been alleged also that the role of the Logos or Word in John is parallel to the role of God's knowledge in the scrolls: God created all things through each. [4]) These are not really parallel because, unlike the Logos, God's knowledge in the scrolls is not a personified agent of God.

Jean DANIELOU suggests that Jacob's well in John may possibly be a symbol of the Jewish Law, as is the well in the Damascus Document. [5]) This is extremely doubtful, for the well in John is

---

[1]) R. M. GRANT, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, New York 1959, p. 173.

[2]) *Ibid.*, pp. 172-3.

[3]) The common practice in the English language of capitalizing "Spirit" in the Fourth Gospel and not capitalizing it in the Dead Sea scrolls causes the difference to seem larger than it really is, however.

[4]) F. M. CROSS, Jr., alleges that 1QS 11 : 11 and 3 : 15-17 are parallels to the Prologue of John (*op. cit*, p. 161, n. 34).

[5]) Jean DANIELOU, "Eglise primitive et communauté de Qumran," *Etudes* (May, 1957), pp. 216-35, Paris.

Jacob's, not Moses'. The well in the Damascus Document, on the other hand, is connected with Moses in Numbers xxi 18, the passage cited, and then associated with the sect's Interpreter of the Law (CD 5 : 21-6 : 8).

Opposition to the Temple is not a parallel, as Oscar CULLMANN has claimed, [1]) for the cause of the opposition in John has a completely different basis (namely, opposition to Judaism as a whole), and the kind of worship substituted for the Temple is very different. John's interest in the Jewish feasts is not a parallel to Qumran's interest in the calendar, for, as BROWN and BURROWS have observed, [2]) Qumran's deep concern for the proper times for celebrating the feasts is lacking in John. Gnosticism is not a parallel, for as noted above, the Gnostic tendency in John is not matched at Qumran.

"Modified dualism" is alleged by Father BROWN to be common to John and Qumran, that is, both believed in two opposing principles which were created by God. [3]) This is not a true parallel, however, for in John the dualism is not between two spirits as at Qumran, and furthermore Christ, one of the opposing principles, is not created, but is begotten as in Gnosticism.

Various scholars have claimed that John's dualism is "ethical" like that of Judaism, rather than physical like that of Gnosticism. It is true that the Fourth Gospel has a dualism of light versus darkness, and darkness is associated with evil, while light is connected with "doing truth" (iii 19-21). This is an ethical dualism, but not the same type as that at Qumran. In the scrolls the way of the spirit of light consists of humility, slowness to anger, goodness, and zeal for righteous laws (1QS 4), whereas in John iii the main interest in ethics is simply to use them as a means to denounce those who do not believe in the Son. The role of the term "walk" in this matter is discussed below. In this Gospel ethical dualism is rather incidental, whereas with the Essenes and Pharisees it was a major theme.

---

[1]) Oscar CULLMANN, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 74, pp. 222-3, Philadelphia 1955. Also by the same author, "L'Opposition contre le Temple de Jerusalem, Motif Commun de la Theologie Johannique et du Monde Ambiant," *New Testament Studies*, vol. 5, pp. 157-73, Cambridge, England 1959.

[2]) Raymond E. BROWN, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles," in Krister Stendahl, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, New York 1957, pp. 201-2. Millar BURROWS, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

[3]) In STENDAHL, *op. cit.*, pp. 184-6.

Furthermore, there *is* a physical dualism in John which sets spirit and flesh in opposition. ". . . unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (iii 5-6). Dualism of this type is not present in the scrolls of Qumran.

The frequent occurrence of the term κόσμος, "world," in the Fourth Gospel is related to the physical dualism of the Hellenistic world. In John the world is naturally sinful and needs to be saved (i 29; iii 17) by light because the world is darkness (xii 46), hence Jesus' kingdom is "not of this world" (xviii 36). Consequently it is stated explicitly that "God is Spirit" (iv 24). Although the author combined ethical and physical dualism, the ethical is made subordinate to the physical.

That predestination is a parallel is very doubtful. Although John xv 16 implies some determinism, other passages in John speak of choice of light or darkness. BROWN has called our attention to the fact that while some passages in the scrolls suggest determinism, other passages require freedom of the will. [1])

Parallels in language but not in thought

There are some linguistic parallels which are not parallel in thought; the same terms are employed, but they convey different ideas. Admittedly, some adaptation to Christianity would naturally take place; but when these expressions occur in John they vary from the Essene usage, not in the direction of primitive Christian thought, but in the direction of Hellenistic Christian thought!

Although "light" and "darkness" are opposed to each other in both the scrolls and the Fourth Gospel (1QS 3; Jn. i 5), they are identified with very different things. In the Manual of Discipline light and darkness are the spirits of truth and error, respectively, but in John they are Christ and the world, respectively.

In Judaism the verb "walk" (הָלַךְ) was often employed metaphorically to describe an ethical way of living (Ps. ci 6; 1QS 1 : 8; CD 2 : 15-16; etc.). The characteristic Jewish expressions, "walk perfectly," "walk humbly", "walk in God's ways," etc., are not in the Fourth Gospel. In the Manual of Discipline the sons of righteousness "walk in the ways of light" and the sons of perversion "walk in the ways of darkness" (iii 20-1). This has been cited as a parallel to John's "walk in the day" (xi 9) and "walk in

[1]) *Ibid.*, pp. 189-92.

the darkness" (viii 12; xii 35; cf. 1 Jn. i 7, "walk in the light"). Unlike typical Jewish usage, this usage in John is not directly connected with ethics, but rather is associated with belief and knowing whither one is going (xii 35-6). Linguistically, there are closer parallels in the Old Testament to John's usage than there are in the scrolls. In the Qumran writings walking is "in the ways of light" or "in the ways of darkness," while in John one walks directly in light or darkness. This grammatical form without the word "way" is paralleled in the Old Testament (the form with the term "way" occurs there too). Close linguistic parallels in the Old Testament are "walk in the light" (Isa. ii 5; Ps. lvi 13 (Heb. lvi 14)) and "walk in the darkness" (Eccl. ii 14; Ps. lxxxii 5 (LXX 81 : 5); Isa. l 10).

Frank M. Cross, Jr., maintains that Essene reference to the sect as a Unity (often translated as "Community") is a parallel: "The Johannine phrases, 'that they may be one,' 'become perfectly one' (Jn. xvii 11, 21, 23) use typical Essene diction." [1]) The parallelism is the closest in the phrases "to be one" (להיות ליחד, 1QS 5 : 2; ἵνα ὦσιν ἕν, Jn. xvii 11, 21) and "gather (or "assemble") into one" (בהאספם ליחד, 1QS 5 : 7; συναγάγῃ εἰς ἕν, Jn. xi 52). The idea that Christians are "one" is not limited in the New Testament to Johannine literature, however; it is found, for example, in 1 Cor. xii 12 and Eph. iv 3-5. The sense in which the members of each group are "one" is very different. At Qumran the sect is a unity in Torah and wealth, whereas in the Fourth Gospel the group is one in a mystical sense—"one" even as the Father and Son are one. The unity of religious groups was a common idea in the ancient world. Millar Burrows disagrees with Professor Cross' view and comments that the words "be one" or "become one" "are associated with Christ and God in a way that is not all Essene." [2])

"Do the truth" (לעשות אמת; ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν) is another linguistic parallel which in both religious groups referred to doing what the group taught. The nature of this truth differs, however. At Qumran doing the truth is associated with ethics, righteousness and justice (1QS 1 : 5; 5 : 3; 8 : 2), whereas in John it is associated with belief in the Son of God (iii 21).

The phrase, "the works of God" (מעשי אל; τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ), was employed by the scribes at Qumran as well as by the author of John.

[1]) Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 156.
[2]) Burrows, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

At Qumran it was the duty of the Supervisor of the camp to instruct the Many in the works of God (CD 13: 7-8) and members have a mighty wisdom which is faithful in all the works of God (1QS 4 : 3-4). In John it is the work of God to believe in the Christ whom God has sent (vi 29) and a man was born blind that the works of God might be manifest (ix 3). At Qumran God's works apparently are his mighty deeds in history, especially in connection with the history of the sect. In John God's works consist of the Christ's miracles and Christian belief in the Christ.

Whether or not "knowledge" is a linguistic parallel is an open question, since the scrolls prefer the noun and John has only the verb. Nevertheless, in both there is present the idea that the members of each group possess knowledge, the ultimate source of which is God. There are major differences, however, in the nature of the knowledge and in the means by which the knowledge is given to the group. At Qumran the knowledge of God (1QS 4 : 22) does not refer to knowing God so much as it does to knowing the knowledge which comes from God (1QS 11 : 17-18). This knowledge consists of knowledge of righteous laws (1QS 3 : 1), of mysteries (1QS 4 : 6), of good (1QS 4 : 26), and of the Community's councils (1QS 8 : 18). The way in which this knowledge is revealed is through the Torah and the interpretation of the Torah.

In the Fourth Gospel what one should know consists of knowing God, the Father (xvii 3; vii 28; viii 55; xiv 7; xvi 3; xvii 25), knowing Jesus Christ (xvii 3; x 14; xiv 7, 9; xvi 3) and who he is (vi 69; viii 28), knowing that the Father is in the Son and that the Son is in the Father (x 38; xiv 20), knowing that the Son is sent from the Father (xvii 8, 23, 25), knowing that Jesus' teaching is from God and that Jesus does not teach on his own authority (vii 17; viii 28; xvii 7-8), knowing the truth (viii 32), knowing the Spirit of Truth (xiv 17), knowing that Christians are in the Son and he in them (xiv 20), knowing that the Son loves the Father (xiv 31), knowing that the Son has loved the disciples (xvii 3). Jesus, too, knows the Father (vii 29; viii 55; x 15 (and the Father knows him); xvii 25). Jesus has made known to the disciples all that he has heard from the Father (xv 15) and the Father's name (xvii 26). This knowledge differs from that at Qumran not only in content, but also in the means by which it is disclosed, namely, by the Son and by the Spirit which he will send. These semi-Gnostic concepts of knowledge are utterly alien to the religion of Qumran.

Parallels in language and perhaps in thought

Some of the linguistic parallels between the scrolls and the Gospel of John are not identical in thought content, but have some similarity and *perhaps* should be classified as parallel in thought. "Eternal life" (חיי נצח, 1QS 4 : 7; CD 3 : 20; ζωὴ αἰώνιος, Jn. iii 15; etc.) refers to immortality. The extent of the parallelism in thought is open to question, for there is considerable ambiguity as to the precise concept of immortality in both the scrolls and the Fourth Gospel. Certainly the means of qualifying for eternal life is very different.

"Light of life" is another verbal parallel which may have some similar connotations. At Qumran it is "through the spirit of God's true counsel" that all of man's "iniquities will be atoned so that he may look upon the light of life" באור החיים, (1QS 3 : 7). John viii 12 represents Jesus as saying, "he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life" (τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς). The light of life is not precisely defined in either source, but in both it is associated with immortality.

The phrase "sons of light" is a term for the sect in both John and the scrolls. It is found in the Manual of Discipline (i 9, בני אור) and repeatedly in the War scroll. Christians are "sons of light" (υἱοὶ φωτός) in John xii 36. Paul applies the same phrase to Christians in 1 Thess. v 5. The basis of becoming a member of the group and a son of light, however, is different in the scrolls and in John. In the scrolls membership in the sect is based upon observance of the Torah and upon the Community's statutes which are derived from interpretation of the Torah. In John it rests upon faith in the Son, the Light (xii 36, 46).

"Spirit of truth" (רוח אמת; τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας) is a parallel in that in both sources it is a spirit which is divinely given in the new age. Furthermore, there is a parallelism in function in that in both sources the Spirit teaches things. In the Manual the spirit of truth counsels religious virtues for the sons of truth (iv 2-6); in John the Spirit of truth will teach all things to the disciples (xiv 26).

An additional similarity in function is that the Spirit of Truth provides help. The Greek term παράκλητος occurs in the Fourth Gospel four times (xiv 16, 26; xv 26; xvi 7) and has been variously translated as "Comforter" (AV), "Counselor" (RSV), and "Helper" (Moffatt; Goodspeed). The literal and probably best translation is

"Helper." This Helper is called "the Spirit of Truth" (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας) in John xiv 17 and xv 26. The Manual of Discipline states that "the God of Israel and the angel of his truth helped (ומלאך אמתו עזר) all the sons of light" (iii 24-5). The angel of truth apparently is synonymous with the "spirit of truth" (רוח אמת) in iv 21. [1]) In both the scrolls and John the spirit or angel of truth helps the members of the religious group.

There are, however, some important differences. In the Manual of Discipline God himself will cause the spirit to come, whereas in John the Son will send it from the Father. According to the Manual of Discipline God will cleanse man by sprinkling the spirit of truth upon him (iv 21; cf. iv 19-20). This is not a true parallel to God's sanctifying the disciples in or by truth (John xvii 17), for the Hebrew verb in the Manual of Discipline is not קָדַשׁ, to "sanctify" or "make holy," but טָהֵר, to "cleanse," "purify." Also, this function is quite different from that in John xv 26 where the Spirit of Truth will bear witness concerning the Son. The content of the teaching which the Spirit gives is a further difference. Furthermore, in John the Spirit of Truth is not synonymous with light (Christ), whereas in the Manual of Discipline it is (iii 18-19, 25).

In one respect the concept of the Spirit of Truth is a closer parallel to Qumran in 1 John iv 6 than in the Fourth Gospel, for in 1 John it is in opposition to the "spirit of error" (cf. 1QS 3 : 18-19).

"Witness of truth" is another linguistic parallel. The members of the community at Qumran are "witnesses of truth" (עדי אמת, 1QS 8 : 6). In John both Jesus and John the Baptist "witness to the truth" (μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, xviii 37; etc.; μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, v 33; etc.). Thus there is agreement that the truth should have witnesses, but as noted above, the concept of the truth differs. Besides, at Qumran, but not in John, the members are witnesses of truth.

Parallels in general ideas

There are some *general* ideas in both the scrolls and John which are parallels in thought. a) Darkness is bad and is connected with evil (1QS 3 : 21-2; Jn. i 5; iii 19). b) Light and darkness are opposed to each other (1QS 3; Jn. i 5). c) Light is equated with truth (1QS 3 : 18-19, 25; Jn. i 4-5, 9; viii 12). d) It is the duty of each member

[1]) Cf. Burrows, *ibid.*, p. 283.

of the group to love all the other members of the group (1QS 1 : 9; Jn. xiii 34-5; xv 12). e) Truth is opposed to evil (1QS 4 : 24; Jn. iii 20-1).

Admittedly, the last three sections (Parallels in language but not in thought; Parallels in language and perhaps in thought; Parallels in general ideas) overlap and are not separated from each other by clear lines. Possibly they should all be grouped together as partial parallels.

II

With three exceptions, all of the parallels listed above occur also in the Old Testament and/or the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The metaphorical use of the terms "light" and "darkness" abound in the Old Testament. "Walking in the light" is contrasted with "walking in the darkness" in Isaiah (ii 5; l 10; lix 9) and in Psalms (lvi 14 (Heb.); lxxxii 5). The "fool walks in darkness" is in Ecclesiastes ii 14. The terms "light" and "darkness" are used symbolically in Psalms of Solomon (iii 15), in 1 Enoch (lviii 5) and 2 Baruch (xvii; xviii; xlvi 2; lix 2). Light is typically associated with righteousness and observance of the Law and darkness is connected with the opposite. Thus Qumran's concepts of metaphorical light and darkness are very similar to those characteristic of other ancient Jewish literature, whereas John's concepts are not.

The use of the term "walk" to refer to a way of life, etc., is quite common in the Jewish background. In addition to the examples cited in the paragraph above, there is reference to walking in uprightness (Isa. lvii 2), walking in the ways of the Lord (Hos. xiv 9; Mic. iv 2), walking in an evil way (Isa. lxv 2) and walking in the Lord's truth (Ps. xxvi 3; lxxxvi 11). The Wisdom of Solomon charges that kings did not "walk according to the purpose of God" (vi 4). 1 Enoch blesses "those who walk in the way of righteousness" (lxxxii 4). In 2 Baruch the righteous walk in God's law, but the wicked walk in vanity and in their own works (xiv 5; xxxviii 4; xlviii 38). Here, too, Qumran's usage is similar to that which is typical of Judaism, whereas John's usage is not.

The application of the term "one" or "unity" to a religious group is another feature which is not limited to the scrolls and the Fourth Gospel. Psalms cxxxiii 1 notes how good it is when brothers dwell in unity (יָחַד). Speaking of Jews in general, 2 Baruch observes, "we are all one celebrated people" (xlviii 24). These are very different

from the Johannine mystical usage, but the concept in Psalm cxxxiii is very similar to that in the scrolls.

The phrase, "do the truth," is another expression found in Judaism outside of the scrolls. Tobit iv 6 states that if "you do the truth" (ποιοῦντός σου τὴν ἀλήθειαν) your ways will prosper through your deeds. The Testament of Benjamin admonishes its readers to "do the truth," each one to his neighbor (x 3). In comparison, note that in the Psalms God does not do the truth, but all of his deeds are "done in truth" (xxxiii 4; cxi 8). As at Qumran, "doing the truth" is associated with ethics, not with belief in the Messiah.

As for the expression, "the works of God," it occurs frequently in ancient Jewish literature. It refers to God's creation of the world (Ecc. xi 5) and to his deeds in history for Israel (Jos. xxiv 31). We find the phrase in Job (xxxvii 14) and Daniel (ix 14), and it abounds in the Psalms (xlvi 8; etc.). Sirach xxxix: 16 states: "All things are the works of the Lord, for they are very good." 1 Enoch v 2 notes that God's "works go on from year to year." Once again we have an expression which Qumran used in typical Jewish fashion, while the Fourth Gospel's usage is not typical of Judaism.

The idea that "knowledge" comes from God, a concept in both the scrolls and John, is found, for example, in Proverbs ii 6 and Wisdom vii 17. The idea that man should know God is very prevalent, occurring, for example, in Isaiah xix 21, Jeremiah xxxi 34, Psalm xxxvi 10, and repeatedly in the Wisdom of Solomon (ii 13; etc.). The Fourth Gospel's emphasis upon knowing God thus has its parallels in Judaism, but its stress upon knowing the Messiah is not a Jewish characteristic.

In the category of parallels in language and perhaps in thought, there are two which are present in Judaism outside of the scrolls. First, there is the phrase "eternal life." According to Daniel xii 2 and Psalms of Solomon iii 16, the righteous dead will awake to life eternal. "Eternal life" refers to immortality repeatedly in 1 Enoch, e.g., xl 9 and lviii 3.

The second expression in this category is "the light of light." This occurs in Psalm lvi 13 (Heb., lvi 14) with the usual connotation of immortality: "For thou hast delivered my soul from death . . . that I may walk before God in the light of life."

As for the parallels in general ideas listed above, all were prevalent in Judaism outside of Qumran. Darkness is bad and connected with

evil in Isaiah (xlii 6-7), Proverbs (iv 19) and the Book of Wisdom (chap. xvii). Sinners die in darkness in 1 Enoch (cii 7).

In addition to the examples previously cited, there are many passages in ancient Jewish writings in which symbolic light and darkness are opposed to each other. Examples in the Old Testament include: "when I sit in darkness, the Lord will be a light to me" (Mic. vii 8) and "to the upright light arises in the darkness" (Ps. cxii 4). In the Parables section of the Book of Enoch we read: "And darkness to the sinners in the name of the Lord, who made a separation between the light and the darkness, and divided the spirits of men" (xli 8). Outside of the Parables section is this statement: "And he [the righteous man] shall walk in eternal light, and sin shall perish in darkness forever" (1 Enoch xcii 4-5). A similar opposition between light and darkness is described in the Testament of Naphtali: "there is a division between light and darkness . . . neither while you are in darkness can you do the works of light" (ii 7, 10).

Light and truth are closely associated with each other in Psalm xliii 3, "send out thy light and thy truth." In the Testament of Asher we read that "all truth is under the light" (v 3).

An approximate parallel to the idea that members of a religious group should love one another occurs in Leviticus xix 17-18, which commands, "love your neighbor (fellow Israelite) as yourself."

Finally, the general idea that truth is opposed to evil is implied in Old Testament passages which associate truth with God. An ideal in the Psalms is to walk or be lead in God's truth (xxv 5; xxvi 3) and the Lord is a God of truth (xxxi 5).

In these parallels the usage at Qumran invariably is much closer to that in other Jewish literature than is the usage in the Fourth Gospel. If it becomes established—which at present seems improbable—that 1 Enoch and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs originated at Qumran, then the examples from those two composite books should be subtracted. The removal of those examples, however, would not change substantially the general pattern of the evidence.

Since all of the above parallels were so current in Judaism, is it reasonable to maintain that they necessarily indicate Palestinian origin of Johannine traditions? The author of the Fourth Gospel could have derived these expressions and ideas from Judaism elsewhere just as readily as from Palestine.

There are three parallels between John and the scrolls which are not found in the Old Testament. These parallels consist of the expressions "sons of light" and "Spirit of truth," and the concern for witness to or of religious truth. Of these three, the phrase "sons of light" occurs elsewhere in the New Testament. In John —unlike the scrolls—the Spirit of truth is sent from the Father by the Son, will dwell in Christians and will speak things to them. In John Jesus and the Baptist are the witnesses, while at Qumran the members of the sect are the witnesses; also, these sources do not agree on the nature of the truth.

Do these three parallels indicate a Palestinian connection for the traditions of the Fourth Gospel? Hardly, when in the case of two the similarity is so remote, and in the case of the third it occurs in Paul's writing (1 Thess. v 5). The present writer has not searched thoroughly through all of the ancient Jewish literature, and perhaps all three of these parallels exist there. Even if they do not exist today, it must be remembered that much ancient literature has been lost.

A third approach to the problem of the possible relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Qumran literature is to look in the New Testament outside of the Gospels and the Johannine writings for parallels to the scrolls. If we find them in books written outside of Palestine, we may well question such parallels as reliable evidence for the Palestinian origin of the parallel Johannine traditions.

The parallels to the Dead Sea scrolls are just as numerous in the rest of the New Testament as they are in the Johannine literature. Paul regards the "angel of light" as a good angel (2 Cor. xi 14), and Qumran contrasts the "angel of truth" with the "angel of darkness" (1QS 3 : 20-5). Paul, too, can call the devil "Belial" and associate him with darkness (2 Cor. vi 14-15). The members of the group are brethren (Rom. i 13; 1 Cor. i 10; etc.). Colossians i 13 views darkness as bad, for God "has delivered us from the power of darkness." Darkness is bad also in the passage in 2 Corinthians vi.

The belief that God has chosen or elected the righteous, an idea so prominent at Qumran, occurs in Ephesians i 4 which asserts that God chose Christians in Christ before the foundation of the world. The phrase, "eternal life," is found in Romans ii 7 and 1 Timothy i 16. God is the Father of the righteous people in the Old Testament (Isa. lxiii 16; lxiv 8, "O Lord, thou art our Father"), at Qumran (1QH 11, "thou art a Father to all the sons of thy truth"), and

repeatedly in the New Testament (1 Cor. i 3; etc.). Paul and the author of Hebrews, as well as the Essenes, believe that man should know God (1 Thess. iv 5; 2 Thess. i 8; Heb. viii 11).

The opposition of light to darkness is almost as characteristic of Paul's letters as it is of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles: "What fellowship has light with darkness?" (2 Cor. vi 14); "Let us therefore lay aside the works of darkness, and put on the armor of light" (Rom. xiii 12); "For you are all sons of the light and sons of the day. We are not of night, nor of darkness" (1 Thess. v 5). A similar view is in the non-Pauline books, Ephesians and 1 Peter: "For you once were darkness, but now you are light in the Lord. Walk then as children of the light . . ." (Eph. v 8); "But you are a chosen race . . . [God] called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (1 Pet. ii 9).

The expression "sons of light" was employed by Paul (1 Thess. v 5) as well as by the Essenes and the author of the Gospel of John. The idea that all of the members of the group are "brothers" and should love one another is very characteristic of the New Testament in general and of Qumran. Paul exhorts Christians to love one another as brothers (Rom. xii 10; xiii 8), as does the author of 1 Peter (i 22). The ideal of human perfection, with God's help, which was stressed at Qumran (1QS 1 : 8; etc.), appears also in the Epistle of James (i 4; iii 2), in Paul's letters (1 Cor. xiii 11; Phil. iii 15), and elsewhere in the New Testament (Heb. xiii 20-1; etc.).

Truth is opposed to evil in various New Testament books besides the Johannine writings, for example, Romans i 25 and ii 8, and Ephesians v 9. Virtue lists, so prevalent in ancient Jewish literature, occur both in the Manual of Discipline (4 : 2) and Paul's letter to the Galatians (v 22-3). The expression "walk by the Spirit" is in both the scrolls and Paul's letters, but not in the Fourth Gospel. In the Manual of Discipline the sons of truth walk by the spirit of truth (1QS 4 : 6), and Paul exhorts to "walk by the Spirit" instead of gratifying the desires of the flesh (Gal. v 16, 25). This is not a full parallel, for Paul does not call the Spirit the "Spirit of Truth."

The Jewish expression, "the works of God," is in Acts ii 11 in the Pentecost story, when the inspired Christians tell "the mighty works of God." Presumably this refers to God's miracles in history, especially through Jesus. Paul uses the phrase in the singular to refer to Christian fellowship or perhaps to Christ's death (Rom. xiv 20).

In addition, there are three *partial* parallels. One is the idea of walking in the light. At Qumran the sons of righteousness "walk in the ways of light" (1QS 4 : 20). In Romans Christians are instructed to put on the armor of light and walk as in the day (xiii 12-13). These are not identical linguistically, but both refer to an ethical manner of living. More remote in parallelism is the association of truth with the means of purification in both the Manual of Discipline and 1 Peter. In the former God will cleanse man by sprinkling the spirit of truth upon him (1QS 4 : 21). In 1 Peter i 22 Christians have cleansed their souls by their obedience to the truth.

The term "way" as a metaphor for a pattern of living was prevalent in Judaism, especially among the Essenes. It is repeated many times in the Dead Sea scrolls (1QS 3 and 4; 5 : 7; 10 : 21; etc.) where it refers to living according to the teachings of the sect. The author of 2 Peter uses the expressions "way of truth" and "way of righteousness" to refer to Christian faith and doctrine in contrast to heresies (ii 2, 21), which is not a close parallel in thought. Even in Acts "the way of God" (xviii 25-6) probably refers more to beliefs concerning Jesus himself than the ethics he taught.

Of the above group of parallels between the scrolls and the rest of the New Testament, all but two are in the Old Testament. Those two are the phrase "sons of light" and the idea that truth is associated with the means to purification.

Without resorting to statistics, it can be truly said that there are about as many parallels between the scrolls and the New Testament outside of the Gospels and the Johannine Epistles as there are between the scrolls and the Fourth Gospel. But what of the Johannine Epistles? In the Johannine Epistles these parallels to Qumran occur: the members of the group are brethren (1 Jn. iii 13-14; 3 Jn. 3) and should love one another (1 Jn. ii 9-10); two opposing spirits, the "spirit of truth" and the "spirit of error" (but their functions are different: in 1 John they inspire true and false prophecy, respectively (1 Jn. iv 1-6), while at Qumran they determine behavior in general); "doing the truth" (1 Jn. i 6); "walk in the light" or "walk in the darkness" (1 Jn. i 6-7); "walk in the truth" (2 Jn. 4; 3 Jn. 4).

Even if we add these parallels from the Johannine Epistles to those from the Fourth Gospel, there are still about as many parallels to the scrolls to be found in the rest of the New Testament as in the Johannine writings.

In summary, certain questions should be asked. Since there is so much dissimilarity between the Dead Sea scrolls and the Fourth Gospel in that each literature has so many important features which are not in the other, and since so many alleged parallels are too remote to be real parallels, how can it be maintained that the traditions in each necessarily come from the same environment? Since so few of the parallels are very close or are parallel in both language and thought, is it very probable that there is much relationship between their origins? When John's parallels differ from Qumran thought, they usually differ in a direction *away from* primitive Christianity and *toward* the Hellenistic background and the later church; is this compatible with the claim for the authenticity of Johannine tradition? Since the vast majority of the parallels between Qumran and John occur in the Old Testament and Apocrypha which were used by virtually all Christians, and/or in the Jewish Pseudepigrapha of which part originated in Alexandria, why should anyone jump to the conclusion that these parallels necessarily point to Palestinian origins? Why should anyone think that John is very Jewish when its use of Jewish terms is, unlike Qumran, so far from Jewish usage? Again, since as many parallels with Qumran occur in the rest of the New Testament as in the Johannine writings, and since the parallels in these other Christian writings are usually non-Palestinian in origin, what evidence is there that the Johannine parallels point in a different direction, namely, to Palestine? As for those few scholars who have claimed that the Qumran parallels indicate that the Fourth Gospel's traditions are Palestinian and early, have they not neglected to see the total historical situation?

Do the Jewish parallels with the Fourth Gospel necessarily indicate that its author was a Jewish Christian, as many scholars seem to think? Hardly.

The Gospel of John is full of evidence that the author was a Gentile Christian. His attitude toward "the Jews," the Jewish patriarchs, and "your law" is that characteristic of Gentile Christians, not Jewish Christians. [1]) The Fourth Gospel contains parallels to Gentile thought which have never been found in Jewish or Jewish-Christian writings. These parallels include eating the flesh and drinking the blood of a deity (vi 52-8), turning water to wine

[1]) See Howard M. TEEPLE, "Early Jewish-Christian Writing," *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, vol. 25, pp. 301-5, Brattleboro, Vermont 1957.

s in the Dionysos cult (ii 1-11), and the close parallel in John iii 4, -8, to spiritual rebirth in the Hermetic cult.

These Gentile attitudes and ideas are very strong evidence that the uthor was a Gentile. If he was a Gentile, however, could his ospel have so many Jewish traits? This could easily happen.

The most probable situation is that the author was a "God-fearer" efore his conversion to Christianity; that is, he was a Gentile ho attended the Jewish synagogue services prior to his joining hristianity. In light of the fact that this type of convert was umerous in the early church, it is amazing that so many scholars ssume that some Jewish features imply Jewish Christian authorship. f the author formerly attended the synagogues, he would naturally ecome familiar with rabbinic language, thought and exegesis.

A second possibility is that the author was a Gentile who acquired is knowledge of Judaism after he became a Christian. He may have been converted by a Jewish Christian church and have been a nember of that community for a while. Or, more probably, he may ave been a member of a mixed church; that is, he may have belonged to a church in which some members had been Jews and ome had been Gentiles before conversion. The Christian communi- ies in Antioch and Alexandria must have been churches of this ype. The author of the Epistle of Barnabas may be in this category.

A third possibility is that prior to conversion the author lived in . pagan community which had absorbed some Jewish ideas and liction. Professor C. H. Dodd has suggested that paganism in Alexandria may have been influenced by Judaism. [1]) All of the syn- retism between Judaism and paganism may not have moved in ne direction; paganism may have learned from Judaism as well s vice versa.

These three possibilities are not mutually exclusive. The author ould have had some knowledge of Judaism before conversion, ither in paganism or as a God-fearer, then joined a mixed church vith both Jewish and Gentile members.

Finally, it should be remembered that of the parallels between John and Qumran discussed in this study, all but three could have been suggested to the author of John by the Septuagint, the Bible of all Gentile Christians, including those who had no special contact with Judaism or Jewish Christianity.

---

[1]) C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, London 1935 and 1954.

THE "BOOK OF ACTS" THE CONFIRMATION OF THE GOSPEL

BY

W. C. VAN UNNIK

INTRODUCTION

The following contribution contains the text of two lectures which I was privileged to deliver in Cambridge University, january 1955, at the kind invitation of its Faculty of Theology, and afterwards in Durham and Manchester. They were not published at that time, because I hoped to expand them into a book. Lack of time has prevented the execution of this plan. Meanwhile various fresh studies about Acts have appeared, the most notable of which is Professor HAENCHENS great commentary. In connection with the "Lacan theology" in general more attention is paid to the theme of these lectures than before. But since the conclusion to which I was led, and the way in which it was arrived at, have not been proposed by other scholars, the publication of my solution seemed to be justified. For these reasons it will be understood that the original form of the lextures was kept.

I

THE PROBLEM OF THE PURPOSE OF ACTS

It was a most remarkable day in the history of Christianity when a certain man, called Luke, made and began to execute his plan to write a second [1]) book as a sequel to his gospel. In it he gave to the church a picture of the very beginnings of its existence, scenes from its first expansion into the world; he showed, how the message of salvation spread and was received in a great part of the Roman empire. This was remarkable, because no other religion of his time has done the same to the great regret of the students of the history of religions. Not even one of his fellow-christians, as far as we know, had tried it before. In writing his gospel Luke had his predecessors, because, as he himself confesses, "many had undertaken to compile a narrative of the things which had been accomplished among us" (Ev. i 1). Here he found a certain set form and kept himself within its limits, but nothing has survived of any attempt to write about the apostolic age, to the great regret of all

[1]) There are no valid reasons to doubt the correctness of Acts i 1.

New Testament scholars who miss the chance of a new "Synoptic Problem". And although a flourishing branch of litterature sprung up in the "Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha" of the 2nd century, these acts of Peter, Thomas, Paul etc. are so different in character and contents that they cannot be compared with Luke's second volume. Even if it could be maintained that the name πράξεις ἀποστόλων is authentic [1]), the fact that there apparently existed a kind of πάρξεις-litterature among the Greeks and Romans [2]) does not allow us to say that Luke imitated that *genre*. Luke's Acts is a unique achievement within and outside the borders of Christianity.

In continuing his story of Jesus by that of the first stages of the church he made it clear once for all that Christianity was a missionary religion, an apostolic message to the world with a task extended "to the end of the earth" (i 8) under the inspiring Spirit of the risen Lord. The legacy of this book remained a "pattern which was shown on the mountain" though it has not always been so understood. The present situation of the Christian church has opened our eyes—it may be better than before—to see the task, to feel the inspiration and to experience the comfort flowing forth from these pages. It was a remarkable day when the plan of this book was conceived, but like so many other important days in the history of our faith and of our world it remained unnoticed though its effect made itself felt afterwards right up to the present time.

In the preceding introductory paragraphs I have spoken about this book and its plan in a very general way as it is done so often. But it does not seem out-of-place or far-fetched to ask somewhat more precisely: what was in the author's mind when he started this new venture? He has brought together in his book much material of highly varying character, but what was his scheme and *purpose?* Or was he just compiling stories and speeches at haphazard?

This question of the purpose is always important because it brings to light the perspective in which the writer wants us to see his information. But in the case of Acts it is the more significant, since he wrote this book as a companion-volume to his gospel. Now it is generally agreed that the gospels do not contain a biography of Jesus, but proclaim the good news about Jesus, the *kerygma*.

---

[1]) Cf. P. Feine-J. Behm, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*[9], Heidelberg 1950, S. 77.

[2]) A. Wikenhauser, *Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert*, Münster i.W. 1921, S. 94 ff.

John's explicit declaration: "these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name" (xx 31), can be applied to the synoptics as well. What Luke offered his readers in his gospel was *kerygma*, but what was he doing in giving them this continuation? Was this just a piece of pious church-history, some stories and sayings of highly respected founders of the church—in other words: was this really a "metabasis eis allo genos"—or had it something to do with the *kerygma* of the gospel? The answer to this question is, I think, of great value for the exact interpretation of Acts and may bring to light an essential feature of this interesting and puzzling book.

In these lectures I propose to discuss with you this question of the purpose of Acts, its character and its connection with the message of the Gospel.

This theme in itself is not a new one. In the last century it was hotly debated, largely because of the so called "Tübingen"-position. But since that position ceased to be defended any longer, the interest flagged. It is a matter of course that whereas Luke himself did not give a definite declaration, many scholars have tried to find an answer. In every commentary and every textbook of "Introduction" one will find some lines or pages about this question. But it is a curious fact that, apart from these books which are bound to pay some attention to it under penalty of incompleteness, so little has been published about it in recent years. When Mac Giffert gave his sketch of "Historical Criticism of Acts in Germany" [1]), he remarked at the end of his abstract from Johannes Weiss' *Über die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte* that this book of 1897 was "the last elaborate discussion of the purpose of Acts". These words were written more than 30 years ago, but in the meantime the situation has not considerably changed. Many of you will have read Hunter's instructive book *Interpreting the New Testament* 1900/1950 [2]) and have noticed that in the section on Acts this problem of the purpose is dealt with in a very few lines,—while all attention is given to criticism of text and sources, authorship and historical trustworthiness.

---

[1]) In: F. J. Foakes Jackson-K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I, *The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. ii, London 1922, p. 389.

[2]) A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting the New Testament* 1900-1950, London 1951, p. 105 ff.

This sketch of the present situation is fully confirmed by the Belgian scholar JAC. DUPONT in his indispensable book *Les problèmes du livre des Actes d'après les travaux récents* [1]). In this survey of more than a hundred pages only somewhat more than one page is allotted to our problem! A monograph *The Purpose of Acts* by B. S. EASTON [2]) stands there "auf einsamer Höhe". So it cannot be called superfluous, if we submit the question to a fresh investigation at this moment, when, as was said by PAUL SCHUBERT recently, 'new life has come to the study of Luke-Acts" [3]). In handling this subject the great respect due to previous generations of scholars and contemporary fellow-students bids us first see in what ways solutions have been sought for. This former lecture will be devoted to a survey of the keys put into our hands and to testing them. This will help us to discover more precisely the kind of lock by which the door is closed. For I must confess that in spite of much labour bestowed upon this question the problem has not yet been solved in a satisfactory way. Having thus cleared the point at issue I shall humbly submit to your judgement a suggestion for a new solution in my second lecture. In the present one we shall discuss: *the problem of the purpose of Acts.*

In reading the first sentence of Acts it seems as though these well-known words will give us the clue: "In the first book, o Theophilus, I have dealt with all that Jesus began to do and teach" (Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὦ Θεόφιλε, ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν) i 1. The author addresses himself and therewith dedicates his book to the same person as his Gospel (Ev. i 1). In a few words he summarizes the contents of his former volume. It is clear that this phrase forms a very strong link between the two books: they are parts of one work. Luke does not say: once upon a time I wrote something about Jesus Christ, but he continues his story in one way or another. The whole passage is encumbered with all sorts of difficulties, set out quite recently by

---

[1]) J. DUPONT, *Les problèmes du Livre des Actes d'après les travaux récents*, Louvain 1950, p. 19-21.

[2]) B. S. EASTON, *The purpose of Acts*, 1936, now reprinted in his *Early Christianity*, ed. F. C. GRANT, London 1955, p. 33 ff.

[3]) P. SCHUBERT, *The structure and Significance of Luke 24*, in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, Berlin 1954, p. 165.—(This has also effected the present subject in the course of the last years; but see Introduction).

MENOUD in the *Bultmann-festschrift* [1]). But though, they may be admitted, the solution which MENOUD following Lake and Sahlin, proposes, viz. that this introduction was a later intrusion when Acts was admitted into the canon, and that Luke-Acts once formed one work without a break, not in two volumes, but in one I cannot accept. The Gospel as a special form was too well-fixed and it is impossible to see the contents of Acts brought into it. That the end of the former and the beginning of the latter book are related is not startling and I doubt whether the so-called conflicting statements are really so. This manner of connecting separate parts of the same work is in accordance with the literary habits of ancient authors. A new book opens with a short survey of the preceding part (the so-called ἀνακεφαλαίωσις) and announces what may be expected in the following pages (the προέκθεσις). Besides the examples adduced by NORDEN [2]) we may compare the beginning of the second book of Josephus *contra Apionem* II 1, 1-2 which is very appropriate because Josephus is a younger contemporary of Luke: διὰ μὲν οὖν τοῦ πρότερου βιβλίου, τιμιώτατέ μοι Ἐπαφρόδιτε, περί τε τῆς ἀρχαιότητος ἡμῶν ἐπέδειξα τοῖς Φοινίκων καὶ Χαλδαίων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων γράμμασι πιστωσάμενος τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων συγγραφεῖς παρασχόμενος μάρτυρας, τὴν τ' ἀντίρρησιν ἐποιησάμην πρὸς Μανέθων καὶ Χαιρήμονα καί τινας ἑτέρους. Ἄρξομαι δὲ νῦν τοὺς ὑπολειπομένους τῶν γεγραφότων τι καθ' ἡμῶν ἔλέγχειν κτλ. The first paragraph is a clear analogy to Luke's first sentence and the second shows what we might have expected from Luke. Had he given this προέκθεσις in a sentence with δέ which had been prepared by the hope-giving μέν, all would have been in order. But the trouble is, as many commentators have acutely remarked that this second clause with δέ is missing! In contrast with the beautiful preface of the gospel with its classical structure, and in contrast with the good start, the sequence is in absolute disorder [3]). *Hinc lacrimae*! It does not matter much whether some unknown Redactor spoilt the original writing, as NORDEN thought, or Luke himself went astray and has not properly finished the sentence (so most commentators), the opening paragraph does *not* reveal the object Luke had in view.

---

[1]) Ph. MENOUD, *Remarques sur les textes de l'ascension dans Luc-Actes*, in: *Bultmann-Festschrift*, p. 148 ff.

[2]) E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig 1913, S. 312.

[3]) See K. LAKE, in: *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. V, p. 1 ff.; FEINE-BEHM, *a.a.O.*, S. 77 speak of "der stylistisch verunglückte Anfang".

clear objective statement is not given here nor anywhere else; nceforth the chase for the great Unknown is open.

Since it is an established fact that μέν and δέ introduce either lf of a sentence containing a contrast, many commentators tried reconstruct the "missing" words by an exegesis of the words in e first verse assuming that this contrast-working would yield od results. The word "began" in the clause "that Jesus began to and teach" is underlined and it is then said that Luke wanted explain in Acts what Jesus continued to do after His resurrection d ascension through His Holy Ghost by His disciples. This position however open to criticism for the Book of Acts does not tell at Jesus *continued* to do and teach. In some places He acts directly in the conversion of Paul and in some visions, but in many other aces He is not mentioned at all. Missionary work, that is so ominent in Acts, is inspired by the Spirit, but if one would say at behind the Spirit Jesus stands, it must be observed that in any instances the progress of the Gospel comes about through rsecution (ch. xiii-xvii). Sometimes the angel of the Lord takes tion, giving his command to Philip or liberating Peter out of ison. The teaching of the apostles in their speeches is *concerning* sus, but that is not identical with His teaching. And it is rather ysterious, how the very long story of Paul's captivity in Jerusalem, esarea and his voyage to Rome which altogether occupies a uarter of the whole, can be explained in that way.

Before we now turn to other answers to our question it will be eful to put before us a table of contents. Since there is no clear d unambiguous statement of Luke, we shall have to look in the ok itself and try to find out if its composition betrays its purpose d if the great Unknown has left some fingermarks. Unfortunately e way of comparing his account with that of others and thereby tecting his handling of the material, as can be done in long retches of his gospel with their parallels in Mark and Matthew, impracticable. At any rate it will be clear that the author's aim ould be formulated in such a way that it explains how and why ese stories and speeches suited his purpose and that a definition which only part of the material is covered should be dismissed at least be brought into a wider context. It is also clear that the al is not reached by a rather vague and summarizing definition, ch as: "the spread of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome", for

in that way we do not get an insight into the complicated and somewhat puzzling selection of the material. And that is exactly the interesting point! For our purpose it is better not to be content with a short formula, but to see the whole in its constitutive parts.

In following the description of Luke we see this series of pictures:

I. Introduction: Jesus' intercourse with His disciples after the resurrection, His last commandment and His ascension; the disciples remain in Jerusalem and choose a new apostle in Judas' stead.

II. Pentecost: the gift of the Spirit and Peter's speech showing the fulfilment of Joels prophecy; preaching Christ, rejected and raised; ending with a strong appeal of conversion; the effect of this sermon and the life of the new Christian community.

III. The healing of a lame man in the name of Jesus which is explained to the crowd; Peter and John therefore being arrested give their witness to the saving power of Christ and are released because the fact is undeniable, on condition of their silence; together with the other Christians they pray for boldness and their prayer is visibly answered. Then follows a short sketch of the "communism" of the community with the outstanding deed of Barnabas which introduces the story of Ananias and Sapphira. In a short passage the "signs" of healing by the apostles are mentioned, which leads to a new imprisonment of the Apostles, their liberation by an angel, their second examination before the Sanhedrin and their release through the advice of Gamaliel, closed with the information that they "did not cease teaching and preaching Jesus as the Christ".

IV. The choice of the 7 deacons from the Hellenistic part of the Church, among whom Stephen is the outstanding figure. These deacons are not concerned so much with the poor, but they are preachers—"evangelists" (xxi 7). Stephens' long discussions with the Jews whom he accuses of permanent rebellion against God from their own history; his martyrdom. Dispersion of the congregation leads to the spreading of the gospel; Philip comes to Samaria controversy with the famous Simon Magus; the conversion of an Ethiopian eunuch.

V. Conversion of Paul on his way to Damascus as a persecutor of the Christians; his first work in Damascus and Jerusalem after some time of suspicion; his flight ultimately to Tarsus.

VI. Peter healing Aeneas and raising up of Tabitha in the coasta

districts; his dealings with the "godfearer" Cornelius under divine guidance and his defence before the Jewish brethren.

VII. Spreading of the dispersed brethren to the North; the gospel reaches Antioch where Barnabas comes in company with his protégé Paul; their mission to Jerusalem in connection with a famine.

VIII. King Herod against the apostles; Peter escaped from prison by divine help—Herod is struck to death by an angel at the height of his glory.

IX. Under the guidance of the Spirit Paul and Barnabas are sent out to missionary work; they do it in Cyprus (conflict with Elymas at the court of the proconsul) and in the southern part of Asia Minor (preaching in the synagogue of Antioch of Pisidia—jealousy of the Jews; preaching to the gentiles; mistaken for pagan Gods because of a healing; way back to Antioch and institution of churches).

X. The conference in Jerusalem on the salvation of the Gentiles without circumcision; this is accepted by the Jerusalem circle which sends out a letter, the only condition being the upholding of some commandments for intercourse with Jewish christians.

XI. Judas and Silas are commissioned with this letter; quarrel between Paul and Barnabas, the latter going to Cyprus, the former to Asia Minor, visiting first the churches of the previous journey and continuing his way to the West coast; Pauls own plans cannot be carried out; a vision shows him the way to Europe—Work in Macedonia (Philippi: conversion of Lydia, healing of a slave girl and imprisonment where the fetters are broken through an earthquake; conversion of the jailor and release of the apostles with all sorts of excuses because they as Roman citizens have been maltreated); Thessalonica and Berea (driven from one place to the other by conflicts with the Jews)—Athens (conflict with contemporary philosophy); Corinth (activity of $1\frac{1}{2}$ years in and outside the synagogue after Paul's break with the Jews—he is comforted by a heavenly vision—attack of the Jews before the proconsul Gallio)—Paul leaves Corinth, passes through Ephesus and sails for Palestine—after a short visit to Jerusalem (which is not mentioned by name) he goes to his place of departure Antioch.

XII. A new journey through Asia Minor to Ephesus—This story is suddenly interrupted by some information about Apollos at Ephesus and his voyage to Corinth after being fully instructed—

Paul in Ephesus baptizes disciples of John the Baptist, preaches in the synagogue but withdraws from there and continues his preaching in the school of Tyrannus, more than two years. His healing-power brings a conflict with some Jewish Exorcists who are overcome by the name of Jesus—the magic power is broken, but Paul comes into conflict with the power of the state-cult in Ephesus. —After that he goes again to Macedonia and Greece to visit the churches—on his way back he spends a week in Troas and heals Eutychus on a Sunday during the service of "breaking of the bread". On his way to Palestine he bids farewell to the elders of Ephesus in a long speech: a defence of his behaviour as an apostle, a warning for coming dangers.

XIII. Paul goes to Jerusalem while "the Holy Spirit testifies in every city that inprisonment and afflictions await" him; some examples of it being given a.o. about Agabus. Paul is gladly received by the brethren in Jerusalem and asked to fulfil a requirement of the Jewish law to stop the slander of his adversaries. While in the temple he is the cause of an outburst of Jewish hatred, he is arrested and the rest of the book tells of his apologies before the Jewish people and leaders, before the highest Roman officers and king Agrippa; his Roman citizenship helps him because it entitles him to appeal to Caesar; in spite of the fact that his innocence is acknowledged he is sent to Rome; he reaches the capital of the empire after a long and dangerous journey which is told in great detail; in Rome he finds a Christian group—he has again discussions with the Jews; to them he applies the well-known words of Isaiah vi 9, 10 for they reject the salvation while the gentiles will hear. He lived in his own house during two years "preaching the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ quite openly and unhindered". That is the somewhat unexpected end of the book.

In trying to understand the purpose of Luke we must read his book *as a whole*. I often have the feeling that this has not been done sufficiently, that commentators investigate it piece-meal looking for what is told about the church in Jerusalem, the controversy of Paul and the Judaizers etc. But then its unity is broken to pieces and we do, I think, a grave injustice to its author. For there are strong indications, as we shall see, that Luke wants us to see the book in its entirety. If we take it such as it is and read it from beginning to end, there are several facts which attract our attention:

1) there is, as HARNACK showed, a great unity in style and choice of words [1]). One has not the idea of reading a history covering a space of 30 years, but it is a more or less continuous story. Only in fixing the dates, so far as it goes, one discovers how long a period it describes; only by critical investigation it comes to light that the unity of the picture is not so strong as it appeared at first.

2) some parts of the story are told with great detail, while these drawings are connected with one another or are alternated by very general remarks such as: there they preached the gospel, or: they comforted the disciples etc. While the healing of the lame man in ch. iii is told in exact terms the description of the church in Jerusalem is given in very broad outlines which are of uncertain interpretation. Paul's stay at Ephesus lasted three years, but apart from two or three remarkable incidents in the apostle's conflict with paganism Luke is practically silent about the inner life and growth of the church there. This fact could be illustrated by scores of examples. If it is allowed to characterize his literary habit with an anachronistic comparison: Luke makes me think of a lecture with lantern-slides; the pictures are shown one after another illustrating the story the lecturer wants to tell while he makes the transition from one plate to another by some general remarks. It has struck me that in most commentaries these summaries and transitions are treated in a fairly perfunctory manner. Read e.g. the explanation offered at the passage where Luke describes the activity of the apostles (v 12-16); very little is said about it, but does that mean that it is something that can be neglected? Or take the verses about Paul's behaviour after his conversion (ix 23 ff.); there it is pointed out that this account largely differs from the information furnished by Paul himself (Gal. i, ii). But was that important for Luke? He says twice that Paul spoke with "boldness" (παρρησία) and introduces a key-word of the book. In my opinion these transitions are highly important to understand the train of thought in Acts and they deserve a special treatment.

3) in these last two examples Luke uses the words σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα and παρρησία respectively. This leads to another observation. In running through its passages we discover in Acts again and again the same words, motives and ideas. For the moment it will be

---

[1]) A. HARNACK, *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte und zur Abfassungszeit der synoptischen Evangelien*, Leipzig 1911, S. 1 ff.

sufficient to mention some of them: μάρτυς-σωτηρία—"signs and wonders"—jealousy of the Jews, παρακαλέω, visions at decisive points, a sentence like this: "But the word of God grew and multiplied", which sounds like a chorus, etc. In the second lecture we will return to this point, because it is highly significant. Ancient books were written to be read aloud, for hearing, not for silent reading [1]). The audience was trained to take it up by the ear and not by the eye. It is like music, when one hears the themes returning in various passages and moments. If one begins with marking these "motives", it suddenly becomes clear what Luke wants us to hear.

4) we will try to understand the "mens auctoris", but then it is an urgent need to make a clear distinction. We have before us the story as told by Luke, but that is not the same thing as the factual event itself; it may be that even between the fact and Luke stands a long time of transmission. DIBELIUS applied his method of "Formgeschichte" also to this book [2]), but I wonder if this helps us to understand Luke's work, because this reconstruction is largely, if not wholly hypothetical and dissolves the unity of the literary structure. It is of course possible to deal with Acts as a historical account and then it turns out that there are many difficulties which are duly discussed by the commentators; then it may be that even the speeches which are largely Luke's own work do not fully serve the purpose of the moment as Dibelius pointed out [3]). It is however the question whether Luke wanted to be a historian in the first place; it may be that his story is composed to convey a message. Therefore it is not so important to see where he is contradicting Paul or even himself, if we only hear this message.

5) it is clear that this book shows many gaps from the point of view of history. If it were not for the detailed information of Paul we would not guess that between ix 30 and xi 24 more than 10 years have elapsed. What became of Simon Magus, the Ethiopian and Cornelius? How was Christianity brought to Rome, not to say a word on the absolute silence about Egypt; can we trust a doubtful reading of codex D in xviii 25, according to which Apollos learnt something of the Christian faith in Alexandria, but then who preached it there? Why does Peter so suddenly disappear?

---

[1]) Cf. M. HADAS, *Ancilla to classical reading*, New York 1954, p. 51.
[2]) M. DIBELIUS, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen 1951, S. 9 ff.
[3]) M. DIBELIUS, *a.a.O.*, S. 141.

Why does Luke not tell anything about the adventures of Paul as related in 2 Cor. xi 23 ff.? Nothing is said about Paul's letters nor about the troubles in Corinth. And on the other hand: why is that story of Cornelius told twice over at great length, while so many other interesting items are passed by silently or in general terms? Why do we hear so much about the two deacons who do the work for which they are not elected, while the apostles like John, Thomas and others do not enter into the scene? Why that long story of the shipwreck, interesting though it be, while in other cases the journey is just indicated? This list can be made longer at liberty. There is no sign that Luke tried to cover these gaps. He just ends a certain story and passes over to a different subject. It cannot be maintained that these gaps are due to lack of sources, because we do not know anything about the sources of information Luke had at his disposal. The question whether Luke possessed no more or did not wish to tell more cannot be decided either way. The problem of the historical value of his material is different from that of the purpose with which we are concerned at present. He must have had his reasons for this, even if one takes into account that the arrangement of the material in many ancient writings is a weak spot.

6) we must further consider that Luke is often very short in his description leaving his readers to read between the lines. Let us take that scene in the house of Philip with the prophetic sign of Agabus and the brethren trying to restrain Paul from going to Jerusalem (xxi 10-14). The highly dramatic tension of that moment is not fully described, but just hinted at in the words of Paul: "What are you doing, weeping and breaking my heart?" It is sometimes said that Paul's interview with Felix and Drusilla (xxiv 24, 25) is not very pauline and is not an exposition of the Christian faith; words like δικαιοσύνη and ἐγκρατεια read as if a teacher of Hellenistic philosophy and ethics is speaking; but then the situation is misunderstood. In realizing what kind of fine company Paul was addressing, that low Felix and that noble Jewess Drusilla, one suddenly sees that Paul preaches here in a very concrete way *ad hominem*, and it is clear that Felix "was alarmed" hearing about the κρίμα τὸ μέλλον (not only future, but imminent). — The missionary activity of Paul at Thessalonica and Corinth is briefly told: "he argued with the Jews from the scriptures, explaining and proving that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer

and to rise from the dead, and saying: "This Jesus, whom I proclaim to you, is the Christ" (xvii 3, cf. xviii 4, 5). If we want to know how Paul argued, we have to turn to chapter xiii and even to the speeches of Peter in ch. ii, iii. Much knowledge is always presupposed; to many subjects only a passing reference is given; it is only mentioned so far as it suited the plan.

At this point something must be said about the closing chapter of the book, because it has sometimes been argued that it is defective. It is a wrong argument to say that neither the final judgement about Pauls trial nor his martyrdom is mentioned and that they alone could give a real conclusion. This is only true, if it was Luke's aim to give a biography of Paul in which the martyrdom was the goal or if his real interest was in the trial, but this supposition cannot be proved, is a fallacious hypothesis and a wrong standard of comparison, because it starts from false presumptions. On the other hand we find several important themes of the book here together (23 διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ — πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ out of the Scriptures; the dissension among the Jews, their judgment in the words which all the gospels use in the same way, and τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ to the gentiles; vs. 31). In a *grande finale* the book finds its end.

7) another characteristic fact we cannot pass by is this that Luke does not seem afraid of contradictions such as in the story of the "communism" in Jerusalem or—most remarkably—in the conversion-narratives of Paul (n.b. twice in speeches!) on the one hand, while on the other his "report" of the preaching of Peter and Paul shows a great conformity. These typical defects from the historical point of view once more signalize the fact that the message prevails over historical accuracy.

We have reviewed these aspects of the working-method of Luke, because they seem to me essential for an adequate understanding of his book. What was the thread by which this mixture of detailed information and summaries, of speeches, healing-stories, travels and conflicts are bound together? Or—in other words—what was the purpose of Acts?

This problem has been, says Dr. Foakes Jackson in his commentary [1]) "the subject of much controversy". "Two views of

[1]) F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The Acts oft he Apostles*, London 1931, p. xvi f.

this", he continues, "may here be mentioned as characteristic of modern conjectures on the subject". As such he discusses the irenic and the apologetic motive which he both rejects. The former alternative maintains that Luke wrote to reconcile adherents of a Petrine-judaistic party and the followers of Paul's gospel free from the Law. Once the favoured solution of the so-called school of Tübingen, it does not find anymore supporters among modern scholarship. It may be convenient in this connection to quote Hunter again. Among the three conclusions on which in his opinion most scholars would agree the second one is: "Luke's primary purpose in writing Acts was not to produce some "Tübingenesque" *eirenikon*, but to record how Christianity spread from Jerusalem to Rome, under the power of the Spirit and the leadership of St. Paul. It is also widely held that Luke had in his writing a secondary apologetic purpose—to show that the new religion was not politically dangerous and to commend it to the Roman world" [1]). As far as my knowledge of modern litterature goes, this statement is a fair presentation of the situation, although it is not complete. But it may be asked, if these answers hold good. Therefore we shall subject them to a critical test.

1. *Description of the spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome.*

This solution usually takes its starting-point in i 8 "and you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth", which at the same time reveals the plan of the book [2]). It is true that Jerusalem is the first centre in Acts and Rome is the final station, but if we look closer into the matter this answer is unsatisfactory. To begin with it is nowhere said in i 8 that Rome is the suitable end; in that way an eschatological term "to the end of the earth", derived from the prophets has lost its full force and is changed into a geographical term of doubtful interpretation because Rome was perhaps the centre of the world, but certainly not "the end of the earth" (ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς) [3]). In the second place the book nowhere shows a special interest for the capital of the Imperium Romanum; if this book was to show

[1]) A. M. Hunter, *l.c.*, p. 111 f.

[2]) So e.g. Feine-Behm, *a.a.O.*, S. 75, 80.

[3]) Cf. the quotation from Is. xlix 6 in Act. xiii 47, and Is. viii 8, lxii 11; the parallel in Luc. xiv 47 f. has: εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ. ὑμεῖς μαρτύρες τούτων.

"der Siegeslauf des Evangelium" (WIKENHAUSER) [1]) to Rome, one would have expected that more about the effect of the preaching would have been recorded. In the third place if it was Paul who was to bring the gospel there, we must say that he "missed the bus", because there *was* a Christian *ekklesia* before his coming and Luke is fully aware of that (see xxviii 15). If Luke really wished to tell this story of the spreading of the Gospel, it is not clear why he did not tell something more about the missionaries of the dispersion (xi 19 ff.), about Egypt so important with its large Jewish colonies, why he did not tell more about the other apostles. Why that lengthly report of Pauls imprisonment, its discourses before Felix and Festus? Besides that it does not explain the selection of the material and the special features of the composition we sketched before.

2. *Missionary motive.*

Then i 8 is read as a command to go out into the world which is fulfilled by the disciples. It must, however, be noticed that the phrasing of this verse is quite different from that in Matth. xxviii 18. On this assumption it is interesting to see that the disciples are not obedient to their Lord, because they remain in Jerusalem, even after Pentecost, and that the persecution (viii 1 ff.) is necessary to remind them of their task. They are witnesses, but not immediately missionaries. Paul does not rush off to missionary work, but is specially called (xiii 1), in spite of the voice at his conversion. In this connection we may also dismiss the idea that Luke wanted to demonstrate the *transition from Judaism to Gentile Christianity*. It should be observed that although Paul officially separates himself three times from the Jews (xiii 46 ff.; xviii 6; xix 9), he is always going to the synagogue first in the next town. It is true that the salvation is also preached to the pagan population, but the gentiles are incorporated while the Jews become divided (Luke is here in the same line as Paul, Rom. ix-xi). Had he wished to show this, why did he not tell more about Philip and his companions?

3. *Apologetic motive.*

Under this heading one points to the favorable or neutral reactions of the many Roman officials which figure in these pages; their attitude is in flatt contrast with that of the Jewish authorities;

[1]) A. WIKENHAUSER, *Die Apostelgeschichte*[2], Regensburg 1951, S. 8.

n their eyes Paul is innocent and the author stresses his roman citizenship [1]). It is either an apology for Paul or for Christianity as a whole being presented as a *religio licita*. As we heard from HUNTER this is only a secondary motive. That is right, for it manifestly cannot explain such stories as that of Ananias and Sapphira. Would it be a recommendation of the Christianity for Roman officials if they read that one should be more obedient to God than to men? The picture of the Roman magistrates is at the highest neutral, but not extremely favourable.

4. *Anti-jewish motive.*

The only author who in recent years underlined this element was KLAUSNER in his interesting book *From Jesus to Paul*. According to him Luke wanted to recommend Christianity to the expense of Judaism after 70 A.D.: the Jews are always the black sheep. Against this opinion we may say that the links with the Jewish people are always upheld. They are called "brethren" who crucified Jesus in ignorance (iii 17); the apostles go out to win the Jews and Paul goes everywhere first to the synagogues, in spite of bad experiences at former occasions, see also xiii 26, xxii 1, xxiii 1, 5, even in the very last chapter there is an intimate contact xxviii 17 in Rome. Is it historically beside the mark that they opposed against Christianity, since it was in their circles that the new faith arose?

5. *Instruction and edification.*

Either of the individual Theophilus or of the church in general. This was the solution of FOAKES JACKSON and DUPONT who referring to KÜMMEL said: "il a écrit dans un but missionaire, les Actes sont destinées au communautés chrétiennes et à leur catéchumènes" [2]). This is quite simple, but in my opinion this is exactly the place where the unsolved problem itself begins: how did these materials serve the purpose? These words are open to so many interpretations that they hide the real question instead of answering. it.

6. *Preaching.*

This was specially brought to the fore by DIBELIUS in one of his *Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. It is written in order to bring the

[1]) See xvi 35 ff., xxii 25 ff., xxiii 29, xxvi 31 f., xxviii 18, also the attitude of Gallio in xviii 14 ff.

[2]) DUPONT, *l.c.*, p. 20.

readers "to acknowledge in adoration what the gospel is and how it conquers men" [1]). It is interesting to notice that DIBELIUS ends by calling Luke a preacher in his article on "the first Christian historian".—Although I agree that this book has its aim in preaching and not in history for its own sake, and although the great learning of DIBELIUS has given us a wealth of many excellent observations, here arises the big question to which he gave us no answer: why was it necessary to write this book as a sequel to the gospel? was the gospel in itself not sufficient? for what reasons did Luke act as an historian of the early church? Or let me formulate it in another way: was it a mistake of the later generations that this "first christian historian" had to leave the name "Father of Church-history" to Eusebius while he had to share the name "evangelist" with three other men?

We have analysed these various solutions one by one, but it must be understood that most authors give a combination of them because of the complexity of the problem. But since they point in different directions and are not a sufficient explanation of the whole book or are based on incomplete exegesis, it will be not out of place if we try another track. It goes without saying that the motives we discussed did not grow out of nonsense; a certain amount of acute listening to the text is underlying them and we must take full account to that. At the same time we will pay due attention to the method applied by Luke, more than is generally done. It may be that we can raise our answer beyond the level of "conjectures", as FOAKES JACKSON called it [2]), because it offers a clue to the problem: why has Luke compiled this complex mass of material in this form to serve as a second part to his gospel?

II

THE SCOPE OF ACTS

The problem we shall try to solve is: what purpose was in Luke's mind, when he started to add this second volume to his Gospel; was it a book of a different character or not; how did the complex material he used serve his intentions?

It is not only for the sake of curiosity, neither for merely literary

[1]) M. DIBELIUS, *a.a.O.*, S. 117.
[2]) F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, *l.c.*, p. xvi.

reasons that we look out for an answer. The writings of early Christianity have their place in the life of the church, their "Sitz im Leben", to say it with an expression coined by DIBELIUS. They are not written for the joy of writing, but have a task in the edification of the church or in the propagation of the gospel. Their publication is an expression of the faith in order to build up that of other people.

That this general characteristic of early Christian literature can also be applied to our specific problem, is apparent from an article which the German scholar KÄSEMANN published under the title "Das Problem des historischen Jesus" [1]). According to KÄSEMANN the very fact that this continuation was written signalizes a complete change in the spiritual atmosphere of the early church, because this history of the apostles was possible only on condition that the eschatology out of which the first circle of Jesus' disciples lived had been replaced by quite another outlook. "Man schreibt nicht die Geschichte der Kirche, wenn man täglich das Weltende erwartet". Primitive eschatology was substituted by a history of salvation ("Heilsgeschichte"), because the expected parousia did not come and historical continuity was to be reckoned with. The work of Jesus becomes the "initium christianismi" and Acts shows the pictures of the sacred past [2]). In reading this one is reminded of the word of Loisy, that the Kingdom of God was announced in the Gospel, but that the church came into existance [3]). This view of KÄSEMANN is shared by various scholars in Germany. It is the idea developed by an influential author like BULTMANN in his *Theology of the N.T.* [4]) and forms the basis of the research which CONZELMANN published in his *Die Mitte der Zeit, Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* [5]). The answer to our question has a bearing upon much wider issues, upon the whole course of theological thinking and Christian living in the N.T.

---

[1]) E. KÄSEMANN, *Das Problem des historischen Jesus*, in: *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* LI (1954), S. 125 ff.

[2]) E. KÄSEMANN, *a.a.O.*, S. 136 ff.

[3]) A. LOISY, *Autour d'un petit livre*[2], Paris 1903, p. XXV: "l'Evangile, qui annonçait le prochain avènement du royaume de Dieu, a produit la religion chrétienne et l'Eglise catholique".

[4]) R. BULTMANN, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen 1953, S. 462 f. in a chapter on "die Wandlung des Selbstverständnisses der Kirche".

[5]) H. CONZELMANN, *Die Mitte der Zeit, Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*, Tübingen 1954 (a 3rd revised edition appeared in 1960).

Although it can be appreciated that here Gospel and Acts are not separated, but taken in their unity, it must be said that I have several grave objections against this evaluation of Acts. The "via negativa" of their exposition will be a suitable path to our object.

1) KÄSEMANN defines Acts as a "pattern of what the Church should be and may be" [1]). This hardly covers the ground, where as a matter of fact so little is said about the church and so much about certain persons in the church. When does it appear that Luke contrasts the sacred past with this own times?

2) KÄSEMANN started with the preconceived idea that Luke wished to write a *history* of the apostolic age. Of course he uses historical material, but did it serve the aim of showing "wie es eigentlich gewesen ist" or is Luke a "laudator temporis acti"? If we think that Luke primarily was a historian, we must naturally give some explanation of this fact. But before this issue is settled as to what he wanted to do with his stories, we are wise to abstain from such far-reaching conclusions. Unfortunately the professor of Göttingen (now Tübingen) does not give us a clue. If it were true that this is church-history it may be said that it is bad church-history because there are too many gaps (see p. 36 f.).

3) The signal points of the "motives" are not taken into account Only two of them are hinted at. According to KÄSEMANN Luke looks back on the apostolic times as the "period of great miracles"[2]), but why? The world of Luke within and outside the churches believed in and saw miracles everywhere; they in themselves were not so miraculous and distinctive of a special period. If Luke draws attention to the "signs and wonders", it has a particular reason to which we shall return later on. More important still is the other point: Luke puts the "history of salvation" in the place of the eschatology, so reads his main thesis. The use of words like σωτηρία, σώζω etc. is conspicuous in Acts, but is is there the same idea as is expressed by "salvation" (German: Heil, Seligkeit)? I must confess that I do not understand what KÄSEMANN exactly

---

[1]) E. KÄSEMANN, *a.a.O.*, S. 137: "ein Modell dessen, was es um Kirche sein soll und sein darf".

[2]) E. KÄSEMANN, *a.a.O.*, S. 137: the time of the apostles "tritt nun der eigenen Gegenwart des beginnenden Frühkatholizismus als heilige Vergangenheit, als die Epoche der grossen Wunder, des rechten Glaubens und der ersten Liebe entgegen".

means by "Heil", but from the antithesis we may deduce that is it not eschatological and therefore has that somewhat vage idea of happiness and blessedness which is so often found in Christianity. Neither he nor CONZELMANN gives an analysis of the word in Acts; had they done so, they would have discovered that σωτηρία is strongly bound up with eschatology and that therefore the whole antithesis falls to the ground.

4) This leads us to the point which is most important of all: the complete underestimation of eschatology. KÄSEMANN holds that Luke reduced this element to a somewhat general expectation of "the Last Day" at a rather uncertain date in future. But the eschatological element is far stronger, is decisive, as will be seen if one has got accustomed to Luke's manner of writing, in listening to his "undertones". He does not speak explicitly about the "Kingdom of God", but it is significant that it is mentioned in the first and the last chapter. It forms an essential part in the summary of Philip's message (viii 12) and of Paul's argument with the Jews (xix 8), the latter even addressing his audience as people "among whom I have gone about preaching the kingdom" (xx 25) [6]). How strong this idea was for Luke may be seen from xiv 22 with its remarkable first person plural: "through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God" (δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν), strongly recalling sayings of Jesus. In the gospel much had been said about this kingdom that is here presupposed. What is rejected in ch. i 6 ff. is not the idea of the Kingdom, but the idea of Jewish nationalism and apocalyptic computation of the day. Gods kingdom is the βασιλεία over the whole world and His σωτήριον must extend to the end of the earth (xiii 47 cf. i 8). But the Kingdom is there as an eschatological factor. We may also point to other facts.—The outpouring of the Spirit in ch. ii is explained by the quotation of Joel which is the starting point for Peter's speech and fundamental for the whole book: "this is what was spoken by the prophet Joel: "And in the last days, it shall be" etc. (ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις). This is the perspective of Acts: they are living in the last days. The Holy Spirit is not a variation, a more divine edition of our human spirit, but it is the gift of the new age, the proleptic "atmosphere" so to say of the Kingdom, the signal of the new and eternal covenant. The fulfilment of the O.T. prophecy is seen in the healing of the lame man and the incorporation of an eunuch in the church. Of this eschatology the resurrection of the dead and future judgment

was part and parcel; this is the *real* point in the famous speech on the Areopagus (xvii 31). It was the stimulating power behind the call for repentance because it was imminent (xxiv 15-25 μέλλειν). In Acts as *a whole* the eschatological element is strong, but the early Christian church had a somewhat different idea of the "Naherwartung" than many N.T. scholars of the present time. The primitive church saw the daybreak of the New Age, but in stead of counting the hours they set out to proclaim the Gospel.

It may be true that one does not write history of the Church when one expects the final day every moment, but—was Luke really writing church-history? This again brings us to our problem.

Our first attempt to lift the veil from Luke's purpose was, as you will remember, a discussion of the opening verses. We saw that the beginning rouses our hope, but discovered that the outcome is disappointing, because the crucial phrase is missing. The usual completion by saying that "Jesus continued His work" in Acts does not stand the test of the facts as appearing in the book itself. Since this way leads to nothing, there are commentators who drop this explanation and hold that ἤρξατο here is pleonastic, for which they refer to the usage in later Hebrew and Aramaic; so *e.g.* WALTER BAUER [1]). Then this verse simply means: what Jesus did and taught. Though this pleonastic use of ἄρχομαι—שרי may be found in some places, this explanation cannot be accepted here, because this relative clause is too closely connected with the πρῶτος λόγος. It would only be acceptable, if there is no other way-out. Is there a third possibility which opens the road to an understanding of the following book while attaching the full force to the words? As fas as I am aware it has never been considered; yet it seems to me that *tertium datur.*

If Luke does not offer any help, it must be looked for elsewhere. If it is to answer the requirements, it ought to be a statement about something which was initiated by Jesus' activity (ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν) and was carried on. That is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews [2]). Many difficult problems of this

---

[1]) W. BAUER, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*[5]. Berlin 1958, s.v. ἄρχω 2aβ.

[2]) It will be remembered that already Clement of Alexandria observed certain similarities between Acts and Hebrews; the words of Eusebius,

λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως (xiii 22) can be left aside. For the present moment it is sufficient to recall that it is directed to people who are wavering in their faith and run the risk of loosing it (see especially x 26 ff.). According to the author the decisive phase of world-history has come since God ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων spoke to us in the Son (i 1), who through His sacrifice "once for all at the end of the ages" (ix 26) brought the new and eternal covenant. Soon the judgment day will come and the readers are exhorted to be steadfast in the Christian faith, in order that they may enter the kingdom of God and not be doomed (x 19 ff.). In ch. ii he makes an urgent appeal on the conscience of his audience; with a "conclusio a minori ad maius", so typical a feature in this letter, he says referring to the O.T. law: "If the message declared by angels [1]) was valid (βέβαιος) and every transgression or disobedience received a just retribution, how shall we escape if we neglect such a great salvation" (ii 2-3), namely that decisive one brought by Christ (cf. vi 4-6). Of this salvation—σωτηρία—the following further explanation is given: ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη, συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς [1]) (ii 4, 5).

The following facts make this text interesting for our problem:

a) ἥτις ἀρχην λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου is parallel to Acts i 1 περὶ πάντων . . . ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησούς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν. Here the work of Jesus is also the beginning of salvation.

b) This text combines a number of elements which are also "motifs" of Acts: σωτηρία - συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος - σημεία καὶ τέρατα - πνεύματος ἁγίου μερίσμοι. (cf. before p. 35 f.).

c) The activity of God as described here strongly recalls Act xiv 3 "speaking boldly for the Lord τῷ μαρτυροῦντι ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ της

Hist. Eccl. VI 14, 2 are as follows: "And as for the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says indeed that it is Paul's, but that it was written for Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue, and that Luke, having carefully translated it, published it for the Greeks; hence, as a result of this translation, *the same complexion of style* is found in this Epistle and Acts" (tr. of H. J. Lawlor-J. E. L. Oulton, London 1927, i, p. 188). As far as the historical circumstances are concerned, this was of course mere guesswork, but Clement saw certain parallels in style between the two books.

[1]) Cf. Acts vii 53; in ch. 1 the author has explained why the angels are inferior to the Son of God (vss. 4 ff.).

χάριτος αὐτοῦ, διδόντι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν.

d) The σύν—in the compound verb [1]) draws attention to the fact that there are other witnesses too; this must refer to the preceding verb ἐβεβαιώθη. Οἱ ἀκούσαντες—Jesus' disciples—are indicated as μάρτυρες which exactly corresponds to the task Jesus bequeathed to them Acts i 8 "and you shall be my witnesses" [2]).

e) This salvation which is expected (ix 28) took its beginning in the preaching of Jesus with which His suffering and ascension is closely connected (passim); therefore He is the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας (ii 10, cf. Acts iii 15, v 31); it is made sure (ἐβεβαιώθη [3])) to these people who have not seen nor heard Him by those who heard Jesus, His disciples.

To sum up: our text says that *there is a solid bridge between the saving activity of Jesus and people living at a distance who have had no personal contact with the incarnate Lord.* The solidity of this bridge consists in the *confirmation* of the salvation by the apostles, sanctioned by God through miraculous gifts. But it is possible to reject this eternal salvation in Christ through unbelief, disobedience and sin (cf. ch. iii, iv). The exhortation of this letter is a call to firmness in the faith.

If we now return to Acts i 1 and the question of the link between the Gospel and Acts, it is obvious that the passage in Hebrews gives an excellent explanation. Not only the word ἤρξατο must be

---

[1]) It is a double compound, where both ἐπιμαρτυρέω and συμμαρτυρέω also exist (see BAUER, *a.a.O.*, Sp. 585 and 1541); with regard to the verb συμμαρτυρέω BAUER remarks: "Schon für Solon 24, 3 D² hat das συν- höchstens noch die Bedeutung der Verstärkung", but in such a double compound as we have here the συν- has its full force "together with ...", as may be seen from 1 Clem. xxiii 5 and xliii 1 and other double compounds verbs as συμπαρακαλέω, συμπαραμένω, συναναπαύομα, συνεισέρχομαι, συνεπιτίθημι etc.

[2]) See p. 53 ff. about the prime importance of this idea of "witness".

[3]) See the comments of J. MOFFATT, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Edinburgh 1924, p. 19: "If the Sinaitic Law ἐγένετο βέβαιος', the Christian revelation was also confirmed or guaranteed to us ... ἐβεβαιώθη. It reached us, accurate and trustworthy. No wonder, when we realize the channel along which it flowed. It was authenticated by the double testimony of men who had actually heard Jesus, and of God who attested and inspired them in their mission".—The word βέβαιος is a favorite one in Hebrews iii 6, 14; vi 19; ix 17; the verb also xiii 9 and the substantive vi 16. H. SCHLIER, in his article on βέβαιος in: G. KITTEL, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Bd. I, Stuttgart 1933, S. 600 ff., says: "Im ganzen tritt also bei dem Begriff βέβαιος im NT wieder der ursprüngliche Charakter, dass etwas *fest* ist *im Sinne eines festen Grundes*, hervor, bekommt aber in Verbindung mit bestimmten Substantiva den Ton von *gültig*" (S. 602).

emphasized, but the whole clause: "what Jesus began to do and to teach". These last words are a common Greek expression for all-round activity. Jesus' activity is saving, "for the Son of men came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Ev. xix 10). His coming to the world is announced by the message of the angel—familiar to us all—: "I bring you good news of a great joy which will come to all the people: for to you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord". The aged Simeon said: "Mine eyes have seen thy salvation . . . a light for revelation to the gentiles and for the glory to thy people Israel" (ii 30-32). It is significant that the quotation from Isaiah xl 3 ff. in Luke's version is longer than in Mark-Matthew and ends with the words: καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σάρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (iii 6). In all the Gospels this tone of salvation is heard, but in Luke very markedly [1]). Here the great salvation Israel and the world had longed for took its beginning. "All things which Jesus began to do and teach", described in the first book were not just words and actions of a certain man Jesus, but a showing forth of His saving activity. This "Good News" was proclaimed by telling who Jesus was; not in the wearisome, boring way of some people who thrust their opinions upon you, who wish to be clear by repeating the same words but by simply telling what He did and said. This salvation is proclaimed in the world.

Dr. Dodd has so lucidly demonstrated that the *Kerygma* underlying the speeches of Acts is also the basis of the gospel [2]). The Gospel of salvation (in its eschatologycal sense) is the great gift to the world, made sure by His disciples, the "witnesses", and "the signs and wonders" of God, meeting on its way belief and unbelief, obedience of disobedience.

These words in the second half of this passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews may fittingly be used as a heading of Luke's second volume. I am firmly convinced that here we have found the scope of Acts, the angle under which we must see it to find the right perspective, or you may say: the hidden thread holding together the string of pearls.

It will be my present task to prove this thesis in confrontation with the contents of the book. These "motifs" will enable us to do

[1]) I may refer here to my article: *L'usage de* ΣΩΖΕΙΝ *"sauver" et ses dérivés dans les évangiles synoptiques*, in: *La Formation des Evangiles*, Bruges 1957, p. 178 ff.

[2]) C. H. Dodd, *The apostolic preaching and its developments*, London 1936.

so and will be discussed more in detail, but since such heavy words as σωτηρία and μαρτύς are playing a part in it, these details will more or less look like gentle hints, for otherwise I should have to read out five or six monographs and Eutychus would have many followers in this place.

1) The leading idea is σωτηρία-σώζω. Peter's speech at Pentecost opens with a quotation from Joel. The outpouring of the Spirit is a sign that the last days "before the day of the Lord comes" have dawned: the day of judgment and doom. "And it shall be that whoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved" (ii 21). This Lord, Peter continues, is Jesus who was rejected by the Jews, but exalted by God. He can be appealed to as the Saviour (v 31), for everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name" (x 43). A summary of Peter's urgent appeal is: "Save yourselves from this crooked generation" (ii 40) and the new community of the believers are called "those who are being saved". The preaching of the Crucified and Risen Lord is always a call to turn to Him the Saviour. The message Peter will bring to the house of Cornelius will be one "by which you will be saved, you and your household" (xi 14) and this message was exactly that *kerygma* about Jesus. Paul in giving a sermon called a "word of exhortation" (xiii 15), shows how the line of Israel's history leads up to the Saviour; then after this historical introduction he directly addresses his hearers: "Brethren, sons of the family of Abraham and those among you that fear God, to us has been sent the message of this salvation" (xiii 26) ὁ λογος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἐξαπεστάλη (if ὁ λόγος . . . ἐξαπεστάλη are really taken from Ps. cvii 20, as Nestle indicates, it is remarkable that the words "of this salvation" are inserted by Luke, see also p. 49 on Ev. iii 6) and gives the *kerygma* about Jesus, ending with the words: "Let it be known to you therefore, brethren, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you".—This saving message is not confined to one people; the words of the prophet Isaiah xlix 6 about the "light for the gentiles" receive a new meaning when the Jews reject it. It is significant that this prophecy is quoted in the middle and at the end of the book (xiii 47 and xvxiii 28), at a turning-point and the conclusion of the work. Under this point of view Luke sees also the famous discussion of the conference at Jerusalem. The issue is the question whether the men from Judea with their teaching: "Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses you cannot be saved"

v 1) are right or not, and the answer of Peter is: "we believe that
e shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as they
ll" (xv 11) and that is accepted under *proviso* of some regula-
ons for the intercourse with the jewish brethren. Paul is called
the girl slave one who proclaims the ὁδὸς σωτηρίας (xvi 17) and
is way is shown to the jailer. He asking in a critical situation:
what must I do (cf. ii 37 the question of the Jews!) to be saved",
ceives the reply: "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you will be
ved" (xvi 30-31). Here the salvation is always the core of the
essage.

There are two interesting passages however where the word has somewhat different aspect. In ch. iv the disciples are examined the Sanhedrin for the healing of the lame man in the name of e Lord. Peter asks with that bit of humour that is sometimes und in Acts, if this good deed of healing is a reason for examina-on. He calls the man ὑγιής and then suddenly says: "there is lvation in no one else (sc. than Jesus) for there is no other name der heaven given by which we must be saved". This transition from ίεια to σωτηρία in itself is not strange [1]), because the latter word n mean in Greek: bodily health [2]). But the remarkable thing is at σωτηρία combines here the two meanings, which we usually parate. This healing of the lame is a sign of the messianic era; is healing of the body visualizes the totality of Christ's saving wer. The second passage is the famous story of the shipwreck ich has always puzzled the scholars. Why did Luke give this ry with such great detail? Presumably not to give students of cient history who are delighted by this information a chance reading the Scriptures. Did Luke use a piece of novel-writing [3]) make his history more thrilling and did he intersperse it with ne Christian remarks? Even if this could be proved, the question nains: why does it stand here in such an elaborate form? Ac-ding to others [4]) its purpose was to show how many dangers Paul d to pass before he reached his goal: preaching of the gospel in

---

) In the Synoptic Gospels it is very frequently connected with healings, my article quoted in p. 49, n. 1.

) Cf. H. G. Liddell-R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*[9], Oxford 1940, p. 1751a.

) E. Norden, *a.a.O.*, S. 313 f. gave a number of parallels; cf. also the nion of Wellhausen, discussed by Wikenhauser, *Geschichtswert*, S. 413.

) So e.g. F. W. Grosheide, *De Handelingen der Apostelen* II, Amsterdam 8, p. 415.

Rome. Harnack [1]) pointed to xxviii 14 "and so (οὕτως) we came t
Rome", but according to Luke himself there was no hurry to reac
Rome; they took things easily and in the meantime something ha
happened. οὕτως refers to the journey as a whole. If however th
chapter is read with that double meaning of σῴζω in mind, it
striking that this stem is used seven times (xxvii 20, 31, 34, 43, 4
xxviii 1-4); this note of salvation, obscured by a translation lik
R.S.V. "escaped", is strong, as appears from the repetition i
xxvii 44 and xxviii 1. It should be taken into consideration that th
sea was an anti-divine power for the ancients; some demonic powe
in the service Δίκη, Justice (xxviii 4). The heart of the story how
ever is the vision of the angel: "Do not be afraid, Paul, you mus
stand before Caesar, and so, God has granted you all those wh
sail with you. So take heart, men, for I have faith in God that
will be exactly as I have been told" (xxvii 24-25). About the purpos
of Paul's journey we will speak presently, but here it must be notice
that God who also graciously spares Paul's companions, will le
him reach the goal in spite of the anti-divine power and grea
danger, even the bite of a viper (with which compare the words t
the disciples Luke x 19: "I have given you authority to tread upo
serpents and scorpions and over all the power of the enemy, an
nothing shall hurt you").

This salvation is the eschatological, ultimate activity of Jesu
Christ; they alone who are believing in Him will escape the comin
judgment of the "great and manifest day" of the Lord. The gentile
do not know God and walked "in their own ways" (xiv 16), i
ἄγνοια serving idols (xvii 29 f.); the Jews transgressed because the
rejected Him who was promised. Therefore they are called to "tur
from these vain things to the living God" (xiv 15) and to repentanc
That Jesus is the One appointed by God is manifest in His resu
rection. "God, having raised up his servant, sent him to you firs
to bless you in turning every one of you from your wickedness
(iii 26), is said to the Jews and for the philosophers in Athens th
real message is: "The times of ignorance God overlooked, but no
he commands all men everywhere to repent, because he has fixe
a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a ma
whom he has appointed, and of this he has given assurance to a
men by raising him from the dead" (xvii 30-31). The backgroun

[1]) A Harnack, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Leipzig 1908, S. 7.

all this is the O.T., the prophetic message and not a Hellenistic belief in saviour-Gods, the eschatological setting making all the difference. All the preaching in Acts serves this end, to make known what God has done in Christ Jesus and what will happen, since the "last days" are here. Luke uses a great many synonyms to describe this message (εὐαγγελίζομαι - λαλεῖν τόν λόγον - κηρύσσω - παραγγέλλω - διαμαρτύρομαι). It is the "word of life" etc. It has often been noticed that the speeches show a great similarity in train of thought; although there is some variation every time according to the audience. Ultimately all these sermons serve to insist upon the same fact: the need of salvation, the Man of Salvation, the way of salvation: rejection of God, the Saviour Christ, repentance and baptism. In this connection the observation of Dibelius [1]) is very much to the point, where he says that it is interesting to notice that the speeches in Acts are in the *oratio recta* and not *obliqua*, as often in pagan historiography; they are not a record of the message only, but a direct message itself.

If one reads Acts a great part of the material can immediately be subsumed under this heading: all *kerygmatic* passages are not Christological *in se*, but within this scheme: why He is the ultimate saviour; all conversion stories find here their place. This σωτηρία is an eschatological fact rests upon the resurrection of the rejected One and the gift of the Spirit. Step by step it becomes clear that "all flesh shall see the σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ": it comes to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles, the door of faith (xiv 27) is opened. The reality of this salvation becomes manifest in the healing of men, because it is the great restoration. Therefore the healing-stories can all be seen in this perspective: the saving name of Jesus. This σωτηρία is the determining and decisive factor of the book both in places when it is explicitly mentioned or indicated through the general pattern and parallelism of thought (e.g. the liberation of Peter (ch. xii).

But can men be sure about it? Is the enthusiasm of the Spirit no drunkeness (ii 13); was He who "hung upon the tree" not doomed (v 30); was the resurrection not a laughable story, rejected by leading Jews the Sadducees, the Greek philosophers (xvii 33) and Roman officials (xxvi 24)?

2) These questions are answered by a second fundamental con-

---

[1]) M Dibelius, *a a O*, S. 144.

ception: the *Witness* (μάρτυς). The following related words are used: μαρτυρία - μαρτύριον - μαρτύρομαι - διαμαρτύρομαι - ἄμαρτυρος.

Many studies have been devoted to it, especially in connection with the later development to "martyr" in its specific sence [1]). Except in these cases where it is used for somebody who is a man of good repute (vi 3, x 22, xvi 2, xxii 12) it is always connected with the revelation in Jesus the Christ. The word has its background in the legal sphere, but is not confined to that. The best general definition of it is: to give an authentic statement concerning the truth, in this case: concerning Gods salvation in Christ. Jesus had bequeathed to his disciples the task of being His witnesses (Luke xxiv 47 - Acts i 8) and this commandment of the Lord stands as a frontispiece of the book. One passage of Peter's speech to Cornelius shows the full force of its meaning: after having spoken about the man Jesus Christ by whom the good news of peace is brought he continues: "and we are witnesses to all that he did both in the country of the Jews and in Jerusalem. They put him to death by hanging him on a tree; but God raised him on the third day and made him manifest, not to all the people but to us who are chosen by God as witnesses . . . and he commanded us to preach to the people and to witness most clearly that he is the one ordained by God to be judge of the living and the dead. To him all the prophets bear witness, that every one who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name" (x 39 ff.); 4 times in these 5 verses!

People who hear the message can be sure about it, because it is guaranteed by the prophets as a promise of the coming salvation and the actuality of the resurrection by those who saw it. In a specific sense the apostles are the people who can bear witness because they were eyewitnesses of the resurrection (i 22, iii 15, v 32). Their work is διαμαρτύρεσθαι, that Jesus is the Christ, the Anointed One (xviii 5) by the argument of the Scriptures and their fulfilment. So Peter acts; in the same way Stephen is called "thy witness" (xxii 20) because he has seen Jesus in glory (vii 56). So the work of Paul is characterized. In his own words it is expressed: "to teach you in public and from house to house, διαμαρτυρό-

[1]) R. SCHIPPERS, *Getuigen van Jesus Christus in het Nieuwe Testament*, Franeker 1938 (thesis Free University, Amsterdam); H. STRATHMANN, μάρτυς in: G. KITTEL, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, Bd. IV, Stuttgart 1942, S. 477 ff., who also mention other litterature. H. VON CAMPENHAUSEN, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche*, Göttingen 1936, S. 30 ff.

μενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλήσιν τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, it was the διακονία he had received from the Lord Jesus διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ (xx 24) In accordance with his own statement (1 Cor. ix 5) Paul is regarded here as a witness, because he has seen the risen Lord. It is from this point of view that the long-winded story of Paul's trial in Jerusalem and Caesarea must be looked upon. Obviously these chapters xxi-xxviii the end of the book(!) do not contain much about the σωτηρία, but they are an assurance of Paul's activity. It is the typical discharge of his task which does not end with death in Jerusalem as he had expected (xx 22 ff.). In the first conversion-story his task is defined by the words: "a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the gentiles and kings and the sons of Israel" (ix 15); in the second account it reads: "you will be a witness for him to all men of what you have seen and heard"; in the third report he relates the words of Jesus: "for I have appeared to you for this purpose, to appoint you to serve and bear witness to the things in which you have seen me and to those in which I will appear to you" (xxvi 16). This is done before the Sanhedrin, the Roman governors and Agrippa. What he has done, was no evil, but the accomplishment of his task: "as I stand here testifying (διαμαρτυρόμενος) both to small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would come to pass: that the Christ must suffer and that, by being the first to rise from the dead, he would proclaim light both to the people and to the gentiles" (xxvi 22, 23). He brings this testimony even before the highest court in Rome. That happens most clearly as a work not of men, not even of Paul himself, but of God's will. In the beginning of his imprisonment at Jerusalem the Lord appeared to him in a vision; saying: θάρσει· ὡς γὰρ διεμαρτύρω τα περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, οὕτω σε δ ε ῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι (xxiii 11). This is the deciding factor, the heading of the whole story.

What Jesus "had done and taught" (i 1) reflects itself in the witness of the apostles who are bound to speak "what they have heard and seen" (iv 20, xxii 15). Because it is the saving revelation of God They speak with παρρησία[1]), this frankness which is a standing

[1]) H. Schlier, παρρησία, in: G. Kittel-G. Friedrich, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, Bd. V, Stuttgart 1954, S. 869 ff.

characteristic of their preaching and a special gift of God (iv 29-31, ix 27 f.) [1]). Quite plainly these uneducated men speak before the Jewish leaders (iv 13), quite plainly they reveal the plan of God (xiii 46-xiv 3). In the persons of these witnesses there is a remarkable parallelism with the work of their Lord (healings - opposition), most obviously in the death of Stephen, Mt. x 24, Joh. xiii 16, xv 20, Luke vi 40 [1]).

This element of the "testimony" by the witnesses and its importance in the work of Luke comes to light in quite a different manner namely in a formal characteristic of this book. The interesting parallelism between Peter and Paul has always attracted the attention of scholars (the same preaching, even with the same proof-texts; conflict with the magicians; healing of a lame man; defence against the Jews). But this is not a special feature of these two. There is much of this kind. From the 7 deacons two are mentioned because of their preaching. Paul makes his first journey with Barnabas, later he chooses Silas. The eye once being struck by this fact discovers everywhere this repetition e.g. three times Pauls conversion is told—twice the history of Cornelius; there are scores of such double texts. Morgenthaler has made a careful study of this phenomenon in his: "Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis" [2]) to which I may refer. He aptly sees behind it the rule of the Torah, Deut. xix 15: "at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses shall a matter be established", quoted elsewhere in the N.T. [3]). The whole book is meant as a witness to the truth! And it will be remembered that Luke himself declared it his aim ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν (R.V. the certainty). He used the historical material for it according to the standards of his time, as they are expressed by Josephus in his *Contra Apionem* [4]).

3) This witness is strong, because it is not only given by men, but

---

[1]) The parallelism between the death of Jesus and that of Stephen has often been observed, see *e.g.* H. VON CAMPENHAUSEN, *a.a.O.*, S. 146 f.— The theme "the apostle as imitator of his Lord" is a recurring one in Acts; a treatment of it must, however, be postponed to a later occasion.

[2]) R. MORGENTHALER, *Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis*, Zürich 1948, 2 volumes.

[3]) These texts have lately been discussed by H. VAN VLIET, *No single testimony*, Utrecht 1958 (thesis Utrecht).

[4]) See my article: *Opmerkingen over het doel van Lucas' geschiedwerk*, in: *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* IX (1955), blz. 323 ff.

is *brought by God Himself*. This comes to light in several features Acts. In the light of Hebr. ii 4 the most important evidence of it nsists in the "*signs and wonders*". They are announced in the ophecy of Joel, wrought by Jesus as signs of the "last days" i 22). Peter and his company did them (v 12) but they are not ne by the disciples themselves, their power and piety (iii 12); ey are a response to their prayer: "And now, Lord, look upon eir threats, and grant to thy servants to speak thy word with all ldness, while thou stretchest out thy hand to heal, and signs and onders are performed through the name of thy holy servant esus" (iv 29, 30). These signs are a confirmation of the word, as ppears also in xiv 3 "speaking boldly for the Lord, who bore witness the word of his grace, granting signs and wonders by their hands" f. xv 12). This is the other side [1]) of the miracle-stories in Acts. The gift of the Spirit is also a manifestation of Gods activity h. ii, x). It is not man's design but God's that realizes itself nd men cannot stop it. The progress of the missionary work is not lanned by the disciples, but pushed along by God. The disciples ave to wait (i 8) before they can proclaim the mighty deeds of od. They are not leaving Jerusalem to preach abroad, but a perse- ution is necessary (viii 1 ff.). Paul's great work does not take place mmediately after his conversion, but at least 10 years later and special and solemn instruction of the Spirit commands to send im out and at the end "he declared all that God had done with hem" (xiv 27, xv 4) [2]). God was with them (cf. xi 26) as He was vith Christ (x 38) and Joseph (vii 9). The experience of Paul Rom. viii 28): "we know that in everything God works for good vith those who love him, who are called according to his purpose" s confirmed here. Persecution, opposition and threats of the Jews erve to the furtherance of the gospel (cf. ch. xiii-xiv, xvii-xviii). t is God who adds to the church (ii 47 par.). Through heavenly isions, also foretold as a sign of the "last days" the disciples are ncouraged (xviii 9, xxiii 11-27) and the way is shown to them ch. x very conspicuous - xvi). The plan of God is unfolded—again

---

[1]) They have of course also the character of demonstrating the saving power of Jesus' work, see p. 51.

[2]) Since the delivery of these lectures I investigated this expression in: *Dominus Vobiscum, the background of a liturgical formula*, in: *New Testament Essays, studies in memory of T. W. Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, Manchester 1959, p. 270 ff.

and again δεῖ is used: in the life of Christ and in that of his disciples[1]).

4) The fourth point is the *reception of this message*. When it is proclaimed and manifests itself people are called to a decision; a division between men who reject and who accept it is to be seen (ii 12-13, xvii 4-5, 32, xiv 4, xxviii 25). On the one hand the admonition of Gamaliel not to fight against God does not do any good. The speech of Stephen is one continuous charge against the Jews because of their disobedience which showed itself in the types of Christ, Joseph and Moses: "You, stiffnecked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit" (vii 51). The jealousy of the Jews against Paul, their plots against his life are prominent in the second part. In the sphere of paganism the opposition comes from the magicians, from the philosophers and the religion of the city-god, yea it comes from the church itself (xv 20). On the other hand there is a tone of gladness running through these pages: in Samaria when the word is preached there, and when they later on hear the reports of the growth of the gospel; when the gentiles receive the word (viii 14, xiv 27). The apostles are examples of obedience: Peter immediately after his liberation goes to the temple to preach—Philip follows up an in itself silly command to go to the deserted place where nobody could be expected (viii 26) and Paul declares: "I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision" (xxvi 19). It leads to growth in spite of the opposition, for mighty men like Herod are only straw in the hands of God; they die but the Word multiplies. This opposition is a strong temptation and therefore the churches are warned, admonished (παρακαλέω) and strengthened by various visits.

The two volumes of Luke's work show: this is the way of the Word in this world, the Word of God, the Word of Salvation. These various motifs are not separate lines of thought, but various aspects of *one* great fact: God's plan of σωτηρία, how it came to the world in Jesus Christ and how it built the solid bridge across to them who did not see Jesus incarnate. Acts is the confirmation (βεβαίωσις) of what God did in Christ as told in the first book. The gospel is not the "initium christianismi", as Käsemann held [2]),

---

[1]) E. Fascher, *Theologische Beobachtungen zu* δεῖ, in: *Bultmann-Festschrift*, p. 228 ff.

[2]) E. Käsemann, *a.a.O.*, S. 137.

but the ἀρχὴ σωτηρίας and Acts confirms it as the word for the world.

Both Gospel and Acts are dedicated to a certain Theophilus who is an unknown figure, perhaps a Roman official (κράτιστος). Some years ago my compatriote Mulder tried to make it plausible from Acts that this Theophilus was a φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν [1]), a man who was on the brink of Christianity and wanted to have certainty. Our analysis of the book would excellently fit this theory, especially if we assume that this Theophilus lived in Rome, though we have no external evidence to make this certain. It may be that Luke compiled his book for people like those in Hebrews who were wavering in their faith. At any rate Luke calls on history as a sure foundation for the message: in these last days there is salvation for all who believe in Jesus Christ!

In these lectures I have strictly confined myself to the task of elucidating the purpose of Acts. We did not enter into the problems of historical criticism important though they are for a further study of the book. I hope that my conclusion: *this book is not a "metabasis eis allo genos", but a legitimate sequel and complement to Luke's gospel because it formed its confirmation,* may meet with your approval. For if it can be accepted it is not only a gain for N.T. theology, but also for the preaching of the gospel to-day.

---

[1]) H. MULDER, *Theophilus de "Godvrezende"*, in: *Arcana Revelata, een bundel Nieuw-Testamentische studiën aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. F. W. Grosheide*, Kampen 1951, blz. 77 ff.

CONCERNING THE DATE OF PAUL'S MACEDONIAN MINISTRY

BY

M. JACK SUGGS

Brite College of the Bible Texas Christian University Ft. Worth, Texas, U.SA.

In 1950 Dr. John KNOX published a new chronology of the life of Paul based on the evidence of the letters, rather than Acts. [1]) Perhaps the most notable feature of this chronology was that it located Paul in Macedonia and Achaea prior to A.D. 45. This would obviously call for dating the Thessalonian correspondence "not long after A. D. 40," [2]) and diverges sharply from the conventional understanding of the period of Paul's Macedonian ministry.

The early dating of Paul's European activity was argued by KNOX on the sound grounds that the chronology of Galatians does not have room for such a mission after the Jerusalem conference and has too much room to omit it prior to the conference. The chief additional evidence presented which would require an early date for Paul's Macedonian mission is drawn from Acts xviii 2, "And he found a Jew name Aquila, a native of Pontus, lately come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had commanded all the Jews to leave Rome." Dr. KNOX argues correctly that "the most probable date for the edict is A. D. 41," [3]) but his careful scholarship leads him to confess that he does not have a great deal of confidence in using this incident for constructing a chronology.

The result is that Dr. KNOX presents a plausible, but not finally conclusive, argument for Paul's presence in Achaea by *ca.* A. D. 41. This argument would be considerably strengthened if either the Corinthian or Macedonian correspondence yielded evidence in support of the European provinces as among the *first* of Paul's

---

[1]) *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, New York 1950: his earlier work on this subject appeared in *Fourteen Years Later: a Note on the Pauline Chronology. Journal of Religion*, XVI (1936), 341-349; and *The Pauline Chronology*, *JBL*, LVIII (1939), 15-29.

[2]) *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[3]) *Ibid.*, p. 82.

missionary fields. Such evidence, however, would call in question, not only the Acts chronology, but the order in which Acts presents the areas of Paul's work. And about this latter aspect of the Acts account even Dr. KNOX professed satisfaction. [1])

Three statements in the letters to Thessalonica and Philippi may be interpreted as implying that Macedonia was probably the first, or at any rate among the first, areas evangelized by the apostle. It is the purpose of this paper to deal briefly with these statements.

1. The first passage to be considered is that at Phil. iv 15-16. "And you Philippians yourselves know that in the beginning of the gospel, when I left Macedonia, no church entered into partnership with me in giving and receiving except you only; for even in Thessalonica you sent me help once and again."

If we did not have Acts, it is difficult to see how the words εν αρχη του ευαγγελιου οτε εξηλθον απο Μακεδονιας could be understood as meaning anything except: "at the outset of my preaching of the gospel, which is to be dated in terms of my mission in Macedonia".

This is not, of course, the usual understanding of the passage found in modern commentaries. The common interpretation is succinctly expressed by E. F. SCOTT.

> (Paul) describes this period of his work as the beginning of the gospel, although he had then been a missionary for many years: but he writes from the Philippian point of view. [2])

This view harmonizes Paul's words with Acts' conception of his ministry. However, there is nothing about the passage in question which suggests that Paul was, indeed, writing "from the Philippian point of view." His words are not most naturally understood in this fashion—until one feels the tension between what is written in Philippians and in Acts.

In his commentary on *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, LIGHTFOOT attempted to explain Phil. iv 15-16 as a reference to "the earliest days of the Gospel," making εν αρχη του ευαγγελιου so general that the phrase could signify the beginning of the Christian movement. [3]) This interpretation fails because it ignores

---

[1]) *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[2]) *The Epistle to the Philippians*, (The Interpreter's Bible, [New York 1955], Vol. XI), p. 125.

[3]) London 1868, p. 163. This is in all probability what the phrase means at I Clem. 47: 2. But that is another matter altogether, since Clement's date permits this general reference to the "days of the gospel's beginning".

the fact that Paul was writing his letter in what was still the earliest days of the gospel in this broad sense.

M. R. VINCENT cites an essay in which LIGHTFOOT advanced another interpretation, "that as the entrance into Macedonia was one of the two most important stages in Paul's missionary life, he speaks of his labors in Macedonia as the *beginning* of the gospel, though his missionary career was now half run." [1])

A similar view was advanced by Maurice JONES ,who argued:

> This is one of those expressions which illustrate the very considerable importance which the Apostle attached to the Macedonian mission as the first step towards the bringing of the Gospel to Rome, the center of the Empire, and, therefore, towards the evangelising of the world. In 2 Thess. ii 13, according to a reading which is well attested, he speaks of the Church in Thessalonica as 'the first fruit of the gospel," and his language here in describing the mission in that region emphasizes the same view. [2])

Both LIGHTFOOT and JONES correctly see that Paul's statement implies a "beginning of the gospel" which is not satisfied by asserting that he "writes from the Philippian point of view."

Ernst LOHMEYER approaches this question in commenting on Phil. iv 15.

> Und das gleiche sagt der Ausdruck: Zu Anfang meiner Verkündung. Aber ist denn wirklich die Mission zu Philippi der Anfang des paulinischen Werkes? Sie ist wohl der Anfang der Gemeinde, aber der Mission nur dann, wenn man sie auf den Kreis der am Ägäischen Meer liegenden oder noch genauer den der europäischen Provinzen bezieht. Aber diese Beschränkung ist nirgends ausgesprochen.
>
> Nimmt man die Worte so wie sie dastehen, dann ist mit der Verkündung des Evangeliums in Philippi überhaupt der Anfang der paulinischen Mission gesetzt. [3])

But LOHMEYER does not "take the words just as they stand." Instead, he harmonizes Phil. iv 15 with Acts by emphasizing (a) the fact that Philippi was the first European mission and (b) the possibility that this was actually the first campaign in which Paul was the leader of the enterprise. This, LOHMEYER believes, would explain how the Philippian mission removed from Paul's mind all

---

[1]) *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon* (International Critical Commentary, [New York 1897], Vol. XXXIX), p. 147; the essay in question is in J.B. LIGHTFOOT, *Biblical Essays*, London 1893, pp. 237-250.

[2]) *The Epistle to the Philippians* (Westminster Commentaries, [London 1918], Vol. XXXVIII), p. 75.

[3]) *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon*, (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament [Göttingen 1953], Vol. IX), p. 184.

ces of significant former activity. Thus, LOHMEYER joins company with LIGHTFOOT and JONES in explaining this statement. The difficulty with this view is that a first-century Christian, moving from Greek-speaking Eastern provinces to Greek-speaking Western provinces, probably would not conceive of this move as "crossing continents," in the modern sense. W. M. RAMSEY's discussion of this question is authoritative.

> A broad distinction between the two opposite sides of the Hellespont as belonging to two different Continents, had no existence in the thought of those who lived in the Aegean lands, and regarded the sea as the path connecting the Aegean countries with each other; and the distinction had no more existence in a political point of view, for Macedonia and Asia were merely two provinces of the Roman Empire, closely united by common language and character, and divided from the Latin-speaking provinces further west.[1])

Therefore, whether one argues with SCOTT that Phil. iv 15-16 is written "from the Philippian point of view" or with LOHMEYER that Paul refers to the beginning of his *European* activity, he must depend on something other than the plainest meaning of the statement. The "something other" is obviously Acts' outline of the apostle's career. If one had only this passage in Philippians to rely upon, he would conclude that the beginning of Paul's preaching of the gospel was in Macedonia.

2. Phil. i 5 contains a second statement which—*if we did not have Acts*—would probably require the interpretation that the Philippians had been associated with Paul's missionary career from its inception. Paul wrote that the church at Philippi had had a partnership with him "in the gospel from the first day until now." This expression will mean something like "from the day we met until now" to those who depend on Acts for its interpretation. Without Acts and in the light of Phil. iv 15-16 it would be natural to understand Phil. i 5 as meaning that the Macedonian church had had a partnership in Paul's preaching from the outset.

3. A statement of similar significance was made to the other Macedonian church whose letters from Paul are preserved. At 2 Thess. ii 13, Paul declared: "But we are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren beloved by the Lord, because God chose you from the beginning to be saved . . ." (RSV).

A variant reading which has the support of BG 33 *f* vg sy^{h} bo reads "as the firstfruits" (απαρχην) for "from the beginning" (απ

---

[1]) *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, New York 1909, p. 199; see pp. 198-200 for his full argument.

αρχης). MOFFATT, following VON SODEN, translated: "God h chosen you as the first to be reaped for salvation." RSV relegat the variant απαρχην to a footnote, where it is translated "as th first converts." The more difficult reading is απαρχην and it attested by good manuscript authority. It is hard to explain ho any later scribe who knew Acts could have substituted απαρχ for the relatively indefinite απ αρχης. On the other hand, the rever "correction" would have been obvious to any wide-awake scril with a fair knowledge of Paul's career in Acts: by virtue of i potentiality for several understandings απ αρχης might easi permit harmonization with the "facts" of the apostle's life as the are reported in Acts.

However, let us assume for the moment that απ αρχης is the orig nal reading and that Paul declares the Thessalonians to have bee chosen from *some* beginning. Without the Acts account to guide u would it be most natural to interpret 2 Thess. ii 13 as meaning t απ αρχης something similar to what John i 1 means by εν αρχ This is the interpretation usually given and in favor of whi William NEIL argues "despite the unusual nature of the expressi . . . . [because] Paul is not here indulging in platitudes, as it wou be to take 'in the beginning' as meaning in the beginning of th Christian mission." [1]) To NEIL (and many others) "in the begi ning" means that the salvation of the Thessalonians "had its roo in the mind and intention of God from before the world was made."

The attractiveness of this rich theological understanding of " the beginning" is that the *idea* which interpreters find here unquestionably present in Paul. As is usually pointed out, this essentially the same idea as that found in Eph. i 4; and, even Ephesians was not written by the apostle, one would grant that th verse in question has a Pauline sound. This interpretation 2 Thess. ii 13 hits a serious snag, however, when one tries to establi for Paul a usage of αρχη in the sense suggested; the apostle simp does not use αρχη in this manner.

For the purposes of this discussion, let us make our list of genui letters as long as we dare. Let us count as Paul's both Colossia and Ephesians as well as Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatian Philippians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, and Philemon. For that matte

[1]) William NEIL, *The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians* (The Moffa New Testament Commentary, [New York 1950]), p. 181.
[2]) *Ibid.*

let us include even the Pastorals where the word occurs once in the plural, meaning "rulers" (Tit. iii 1). Apart from the instance in Titus, αρχη appears in the singular or the plural a total of 11 times according to Moulten and Geden.

(a) A technical meaning with cosmological significance emerges immediately upon examination of these passages. Eight occurrences of αρχη in both singular and plural refer to earthly or (usually) heavenly "rulers" (Rom. viii 38; 1 Cor. xv 24; Eph. i 21, iii 10, vi 12; Col. 1 16, ii 10, 15).

(b) The ninth appearance is at Phil. iv 15, where "in the beginning of the gospel" obviously refers to a point in history.

(c) At first sight Col. i 18 appears to be an exception to the above meanings. In a context which includes such phrases as "he is the image of the invisible God" (i 15), "in him all things were created" (i 16), and "he is before all things" (i 17), it is declared that Christ is "the αρχη, the first-born from the dead, that in everything he might be preëminent." This use of αρχη cannot be said to parallel that of 2 Thess. ii 13, but it is at least an occurrence in a context which has close affinities with the common interpretation of 2 Thess. If one accepts the RSV rendering, "the beginning," he still could not accept "the beginning" of Col. i 18 as the equivalent of "the beginning" in 2 Thess. The *passage* in Colossians parallels the common interpretation of 2 Thess. ii 13, but the use of the term αρχη diverges. Furthermore, one must ask whether "the beginning" is a fully adequate rendering of the term in Col. i 18. Does it not overlook a contrast which the writer of Colossians intended to draw? Let us reproduce the whole of Col. i 15-18.

> He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation; for in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or αρχαι or authorities—all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together. He is the head of the body, the church; he is η αρχη, the firstborn from the dead, that in everything he might be preeminent.

The contrast between αρχαι and η αρχη is surely no accident. It is thus far from clear that αρχη in Col. i 18 is an exception to the Pauline usages discussed above; it appears, in fact, to be an extension of the more common of them.

(d) This leaves us with 2 Thess. ii 13 and the necessity of dealing with απ αρχης, if it be accepted as the genuine reading. In the light of Paul's usage of the term elsewhere, it appears to the present writer that we must grant that the apostle is "here indulging in

platitudes." While Paul may be shown to have used αρχη in everyday fashion to refer to a happening with a beginning in time, his employment of αρχη as a technical term does not justify the Johannine implications frequently discovered in 2 Thess. ii 13. What the text says (if it is genuine) is simply "from the beginning"—i.e., a beginning that may be located at a point in history. The most likely beginning is the inauguration of Paul's mission. It is not to be interpreted in the light of John i 1. Its closest canonical parallel is to be found, strangely enough, in Paul's speech to Agrippa, "My manner of life from my youth, spent απ αρχης among my own nation and at Jerusalem, is known by all Jews" (Acts xxvi 4).

While the present writer believes that απαρχην is the correct reading for 2 Thess. ii 13, the most natural understanding of either variant is that Paul's initial activity was among the Macedonians.

On the basis of these three statements (Phil. iv 15-16, i 5; 2 Thess. ii 13) it is possible to say that there is evidence in the letters of Paul which, if we did not have Acts, would easily be understood as implying that Macedonia was the apostle's first missionary field.

Is there other evidence in the letters which contradicts what we have found in Philippians and 2 Thessalonians? The statement in Gal. i 21 may be so regarded. Paul declares that, following his visit with Peter three years after his conversion, the apostle "went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia." Dr. KNOX writes that "we may surmise that he did some evangelistic work in those territories, but he does not say so." [1]) Elsewhere, Dr. KNOX expresses doubt of extensive work in Syria and Cilicia. [2])

These is good reason for questioning whether this mention of Syria and Cilicia should be taken as evidence of missionary activity in either. Gal. i 11-2: 10 provides a *kind* of chronology of Paul, but it is important to be clear about what kind of chronology it is. It is certainly not a chronology of his missionary career, as such. There is no mention of missionary activity (not even among the Galatians) in this passage. It is instead *a chronology of his relations with Jerusalem and the Jerusalem apostles*. Three moments in Paul's life are related chronologically. The first (i 15-17) is his conversion. Relative to his conversion, he declares that he *did not go to Jerusalem* to the earlier apostles; by way of emphasizing this, he points out that he *did go to Arabia* and then *returned to Damascus*.

[1]) *Op. cit.*, p. 79.
[2]) *Journal of Religion*, XVI (1936), 342-343.

Arabia and Damascus are mentioned, not as missionary fields, but to stress his separation from Jerusalem. The second event in Paul's life mentioned in the Galatians chronology (i 18-24) is his visit with Peter. He is at pains to show that this visit occurred *after three years had elapsed following his conversion*, that it lasted *for only two weeks*, that he met *no other Jerusalem apostles* except James, and that after the visit was over *he was still unknown to the churches of Judea*. It is in this connection that he says he went to Syria and Cilicia following a brief trip to Jerusalem. The third occasion of chronological significance is the "conference trip" to Jerusalem (ii 1-10); it's narration stresses Paul's independence of and equality with the Jerusalem apostles.

For Paul to say in such a passage, "Then I went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia," is not for him to inject a comment about his missionary activity. Whatever he was doing in those regions (Cilicia was his native province), his purpose in mentioning them in Galatians is clear. He is saying, in effect, "My first trip to Jerusalem did not make me a lackey of the apostles there. In fact, after a short visit with Peter I went to Syria and Cilicia; it is obvious that I did not have a continuing relationship with Jerusalem." Gal. i 21 mentions Syria and Cilicia for the same reason i 16 mentions Arabia and Damascus—namely, to show Paul's independence of Jerusalem. The passage proves nothing as to whether any one or all four of these places were fields of the apostle's missionary activity.

That Paul would have "preached the faith he once tried to destroy" (Gal. i 23) wherever he happened to be seems obvious. It is not as clear that Syria and Cilicia represented the kind of "virgin territory" which Paul regarded as his responsibility (Rom. xv 20). On the contrary, what evidence we have (Acts xi 19-26) indicates that Paul was a late-comer in these regions who would have no choice but to "build on another man's foundation" (Rom. xv 20). The Acts account implies that Paul would have been anticipated in Cilicia as well as Antioch, since "those who were scattered because of the persecution that arose over Stephen traveled as far as . . . Cyprus and Antioch" (xi 19). The meagre evidence at hand indicates that Syria and Cilicia would not fall within the pattern of a normal Pauline territory or fit the conception of his ministry which Paul held at the time Romans was written. [1])

[1]) In the article referred to in the preceeding footnote, Dr. KNOX observes further (p. 343), "When IGNATIUS early in the second century writes to the

Does this mean that Macedonia was the first of Paul's missionary fields? Perhaps not. But on the basis of the statements found in Phil. i 5, iv 15-16; 2 Thess. ii 13, it must be regarded as a possibility. At the least, these passages suggest that Paul's Macedonian ministry came very early in his missionary career, sufficiently early that he could regard Macedonia as "the beginning of the gospel." The force of their testimony requires an understanding of Paul's activity which will locate him in Europe long before his missionary career was "half run." Conventional theories which date Paul in Europe for the first time *ca.* A. D. 50 violate the plain language of the letters by postponing the apostle's invasion of Macedonia and Achaea until the second decade of his career. The problems that are raised by the accepted views are recognized by their exponents. The difficulty cannot be stated more plainly than in the words of a recent commentator on Phil. iv 15.

> "In the beginning of the gospel"—in what sense could Paul so think of the relatively recent time when he "went out from Macedonia?" Before that, he had himself been preaching the faith for at least fourteen years (perhaps for as much as seventeen) in "the regions of Syria and Cilicia" (Gal. i 18-ii 1); he had gone with Barnabas through Cyprus and southern Galatia (Acts xiii-xiv); and others had been active in the work of the gospel for some years before his conversion. The phrase is doubly difficult if it be supposed that this letter was written from an imprisonment in Ephesus, less than five years after his departure from Macedonia. Is he for the moment thinking of Christian history from the reader's point of view—that it was soon after "the beginning of the gospel" *in their province*? Or is he so much under the spell of Greek civilization that he thinks of the victorious march of the gospel as getting seriously under way only when the Greek peninsula itself was invaded? Or may we suppose that he has come to think of his arrival in Rome as a symbolic occupation of the world's capital city by the vanguard of the Christian forces, and is thus able to think of his first approach to a Roman colony and his march along the Egnation Way as the opening of the decisive campaign? Such an interpretation would be more appealing if he spoke of when he came into Macedonia, instead of when he went out. It is hard to feel satisfied with any of the explanations offered. [1])

It is hard, indeed. And dates for the Macedonian mission subsequent to A. D. 40 become with every added year increasingly difficult to reconcile with Paul's own words. For the apostle, Macedonia was the beginning. If this is not Acts' understanding, then one must decide between Paul's express testimony and the witness of some late first-century "Luke."

---

church at Ephesus, he does not claim Paul for Antioch; it is the Ephesians who were the 'fellow-initiates' of the apostle."

[1]) F. W. Beare, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (Harper's New Testament Commentaries, [New York 1959]), p. 154.

THE RECKONING OF HOURS IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

BY

NORMAN WALKER
West Ewell, Surrey, England

The apparent contradiction of Mark's statement that Jesus was crucified at "the third hour" (xv 25) by John's statement that Jesus was condemned at "the sixth hour" (xix 14) has been much discussed by commentators. Two methods of reckoning were in use in those days, to wit, the twelve hours of daylight from dawn to dark used everywhere by the common people, by the writers of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts and by Josephus, and the Roman priestly, Egyptian and Hipparchan reckoning of hours [1]) from midnight to midday, and midday to midnight, for which there is some evidence of use in Asia Minor [2]). As this latter method is also ours today, we may conveniently term it the "modern" method, as against the former "Jewish" method.

Now in the Fourth Gospel there are four statements regarding numbered hours, to wit,

(a) "the tenth hour" of i 39, after which the two disciples "abode with Him that *day*". Jewish reckoning makes this 4 p.m., an unusual time to begin a *day*'s stay. But modern reckoning makes this 10 a.m., a quite satisfactory hour.

(b) "the sixth hour" of iv 6, when the Samaritan woman came to draw water, and the disciples had gone away to buy food for the meal. Jewish reckoning makes this midday, an unsuitable hour for

---

[1]) Pliny, H. N. II, 79, par. 188: "The Babylonians reckoned from sunrise to sunrise, the Athenians from sunset to sunset, the Umbriand from noon to noon, the common people everywhere from dawn to dark, the Roman priests and those by whom the civil day has been defined, as also the Egyptians and Hipparchus, midnight to midnight".

[2]) A. Plummer, *Gospel according to St. John* (*CUP* 1913) p. 326, "Polycarp was martyred "at the eighth hour" (Mart. Pol. xxi), Pionius "at the tenth hour"; both at Smyrna. Such exhibitions commonly took place in the morning (Philo ii 529); so that 8 and 10 a.m. are more probable than 2 and 4 p.m."

the events mentioned. But the modern reckoning makes this 6 p.m., a natural and customary time of day for such events.

(c) "the seventh hour" of iv 52, at which hour "yesterday the fever left him". Jewish reckoning makes this 1 p.m., an unlikely time of day, and difficult to fit in with the nobleman's arrival home the following day. But modern reckoning makes this 7 p.m., a more likely time of arrival at Cana of Galilee from Capernaum, twenty miles journey, and then, after rest for man and beast, of return to Capernaum the following day.

(d) "the sixth hour" of xix 14, when Jesus was presented by Pilate to the Jews with the words, "Behold, your king!" Jewish reckoning makes this midday, when, according to Mark, Jesus had been crucified three hours already! But modern reckoning makes this 6 a.m., giving plenty of time for the mockings and scourgings, final handing over of Jesus by Pilate for crucifixion, and for all the details of the Via Dolorosa, ending with the crucifixion at 9 a.m.

All this was thoroughly discussed as far back as 1880 in a "Commentary on the Holy Bible" edited by F. C. Cook, published by John Murray, New Testament, Vol. II, p. 282 f., in which the modern reckoning was upheld. B. F. Westcott took the same view in his commentaries on St. John's Gospel published in 1882, 1892 and 1903 [1]). So also did the writer on the subject in Hasting's "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels" in 1906. [2])

But later we find commentators who, though cognisant of all that has been said on the matter hitherto, hesitate to decide for the modern reckoning of hours in the Fourth Gospel, and even incline to prefer the Jewish reckoning. The logic of the situation seems to have been eclipsed by an over-riding anxiety to bring the Fourth Gospel into line with the other three in respect of hour-reckoning.

For instance, in 1913 A. Plummer [3]) wrote: "It is sometimes contended that St. John reckons the hours of the day according to the modern method, from midnight to midnight, and not according to the Jewish method, from sunset to sunset, as everywhere else in the N.T. and in Josephus. It is antecedently improbable that

---

[1]) B. F. Westcott, *Gospel of St. John* 1882, *Gospel according to St. John* 1892 and 1903 (John Murray).

[2]) Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (1906) Vol. I, p. 751.

[3]) A. Plummer, *op. cit.*, pp. 84, 116, 128, 326, 342.

St. John should in this point vary from the rest of the N.T. writers." Nevertheless, PLUMMER goes on to admit that "the tenth hour" in i 39 is more fittingly 10 a.m. and not 4 p.m., that in iv 6 midday would be an unusual hour for the events recorded. For "the seventh hour" in iv 52 he admits that 7 p.m. is "not impossible", and that "the sixth hour" in xix 14 *may* be 6 a.m. Further, he notes that John speaks of the meeting of the disciples in Jerusalem "when it was evening on that day, the first day of the week" (xx 19), when in fact it was after sunset on Easter Day, and allows that this is a point in favour of St. John's using the modern method of counting the hours.

In 1913 J. BELSER re-asserted [1]) the view that the Fourth Evangelist reckoned the hours from midnight onwards.

But in 1928 J. H. BERNARD claimed [2]) the Jewish reckoning for the Fourth Gospel.

However, in the same year, W. LOCK [3]), writing in Gore's Commentary interpreted "the tenth hour" in i 39 as probably 10 a.m., and "the sixth hour" in iv 6 as probably 6 p.m.

In 1947, B. KRAFT [4]) supported the views of J. BELSER.

Yet in 1952, Lowther CLARKE [5]) in his "Concise Bible Commentary" maintained the Jewish reckoning.

In 1955, C. K. BARRETT [6]) accepted the dawn to sunset reckoning, provisionally putting "the tenth hour" at 4 p.m., but adding "not a natural point for the beginning of a day's stay." Putting "the sixth hour" in iv 6 at noon, he nevertheless adds [7]), "It is impossible to settle with complete certainty the method of enumerating the hours employed by John."

In 1956, R. H. LIGHTFOOT [8]) in his "St. John's Gospel" edited by C. F. EVANS, stated: "In all the gospels the hours are counted from sunrise, i.e. from about 6 a.m."

---

[1]) J. BELSER, *Geschichte des Leidens und Strebens* & c. 2nd edition (Freiburg 1913) pp. 381, 388 f.

[2]) J. H. BERNARD, *Gospel according to St. John* (*T & T.* Clarke 1928), vol. I.

[3]) *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (*SPCK* 1928) part III, pp. 248, 252.

[4]) B. KRAFT, *Der Sinn der heiligen Schrift* (1947) p. 17.

[5]) Lowther CLARKE, *Concise Bible Commentary* (*SPCK* 1952) pp. 776, 779, 794.

[6]) C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel according to St. John* (*SPCK* 1955) p. 151.

[7]) *ibid.*, p. 194.

[8]) R. H. LIGHTFOOT, *St. John's Gospel* (Oxford 1956) p. 103.

The present writer demurs from this unproved generalisation
In 1959, J. BLINZLER [1]), in his profound and exhaustive study
"The Trial of Jesus", asserted: "the view that John reckoned
the hours from midnight onwards falls to the ground on the fact
that the Fourth Evangelist, like the Synoptics, uses the Jewish
manner of reckoning from sunrise to sunset."

The present writer regards the said "fact" as not established
Moreover, BLINZLER's time-table for Good Friday [2]) involves a
period of nearly *six hours* from the handing over of Jesus *to* Pilate
at 6 a.m. to the handling over of Jesus *by* Pilate for crucifixion
shortly before midday!

Now the Fourth Gospel differs from the other three in its *purpose*
For whereas the latter were written primarily for the edification
of the faithful, the former was written primarily for the *conversion*
of the Greek-speaking Jews of the Diaspora, as J. A. T. ROBINSON [3])
has recently shown. The chief centres of that Diaspora were Alexan-
dria, Antioch and Ephesus. While it its difficult, as Barett has
indicated [4]), to decide in favour of any one of these places, the use
of the "modern" or "Egyptian" hour-reckoning by the author
suggests either Alexandria or Ephesus. Precise time-reckoning and
knowledge of the stars was all-important for navigation, and time-
reckoning from midnight was in use among Egyptians, and, two
and a half centuries before the Fourth Gospel was written, the
great astronomer Hipparchus [5]) had resided both at Rhodes and
at Alexandria, cataloguing the stars, and reckoning the hours
from midnight, as did the Egyptians [6]). There is also evidence
from the recorded martyrdoms of Polycarp and Pionius that this
manner of reckoning obtained in Asia Minor [7]).

As WESTCOTT [8]) wrote: "St. John, in using what is the modern
reckoning, followed the practice of the province in which he was
living, and for which he was writing." One may add that it is
antecedently probable that John would and did in this point vary

[1]) J. BLINZLER, *The Trial of Jesus* (Mercier Press 1959) Excursus XIII
p. 267.
[2]) *ibid.*, p. 270.
[3]) J. A. T. ROBINSON, *N.T.S.* 6 (1960) p. 130 f. in *Destination and Purpose*
of St. John's Gospel pp. 117-131.
[4]) C. K. BARRETT, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-111.
[5]) *Smith's Classical Dictionary.*
[6]) See (1).
[7]) See (2).
[8]) WESTCOTT, *op. cit.*, 1892 p. 282.

rom the rest of the N.T. writers, because he was under no obligation o follow in their footsteps, and because he was writing for a different sort of reader.

Seeing that the "Jewish" reckoning lands commentators in ncertainty, confusion and doubt, one feels that WESTCOTT was ight after all, in asserting that John used the "modern" reckoning of hours.

But there is this to be said. Seeing that it is generally agreed that John was a Palestinian Jew of a legalistic turn of mind, who in extreme old age, over ninety, produced the gospel that bears his name, and that there is everything to be said for the tradition that he dictated his gospel to an amanuensis [1]), there is just the possibility that *this scribe* may have persuaded John to use the "modern" method of reckoning hours, in view of reading public to whom the gospel was to be addressed in the first place. The tradition is contained in Fortunatian's fourth-century Latin preface to the Fourth Gospel [2]), the original form of which, as punctuated by the late Robert EISLER, runs as follows:

> "The Gospel of John was revealed and given
> the churches by John whilst he was still alive in his body,
> as Papias, called the Hierapolitan,
> the beloved disciple of John,
> has reported in his five books of "Exegetics".
> But (he who) wrote down the Gospel, John dictating correctly
> the true (evangel), (was).
> Marcion the heretic. Having been disapproved by him for
> holding contrary views, he was expelled by John.
> He had, however, brought him writings, or letters,
> from the brethren who were in Pontus."

The Latin of the vital sentence runs:

> "Descripsit vero evangelium, dictante Johanne recte verum,
> Marcion haereticus."

This means that Marcion the ship-owner from Pontus was the scribe who wrote the Gospel at John's dictation. That being so, it was not impossible that Marcion should have recommended the use of modern hour-reckoning, and that John should have consented to the same.

---

[1]) Robert EISLER, *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel* (Methuen 1938) pp. 208-211.

[2]) *ibid.*, p. 156.

VON DER SCHAM DES GLÄUBIGEN

ERWÄGUNGEN ZU ROM. 1 14-17

VON

OTTO GLOMBITZA
Friedrichroda — Thür. Wald

In den vorliegenden Kommentaren [1]) zum Römerbrief wird der Zusammenhang zwischen Röm. i 14, 15 einerseits und den folgenden Versen, insbesondere v 16 darin gesehen, dass das „Sich des Evangeliums Schämen" in engen Kontakt zu den Hellenen und Barbaren, den Weisen und den Ungelehrten gestellt wird, sodass Paulus also wie in 1. Kor. i 17 ff Weiheit im Evangelium und Torheit in der Welt einander gegenüber stellte. So besonders bei NYGREN. [2]) MICHEL [3]) sieht „Sich schämen" im Zusammenhange mit der feierlichen Bekenntnissprache der ersten Christenheit. Beide Vorstellungen verbunden findet man bei SCHLATTER [4]): „Anlass zur Besinnung, ob er sich des ihm anvertrauten Worts schäme, entstand im armseligsten jüdischen Betsaal nicht weniger als auf dem Forum Roms. Er entstand aus dem Inhalt seiner Botschaft, aus dem, was er ihre Torheit genannt hat." In gleicher Weise lesen auch LIETZMANN [5]) u.a. diese Worte. Es fragt sich, ob dabei — so richtig dies Verständnis im Ganzen auch sein mag — nicht doch gewichtige mitschwingende Gedanken unbeachtet bleiben. Darum sollen die Verse 14 bis 17 in ständiger Beachtung der Kommentare und des Inhaltes der verwendeten Worte [6]) durchgeprüft werden.

---

[1]) In der vorliegenden Arbeit sind vor allem benutzt:
Hans LIETZMANN: *An die Römer, Handbuch zum NT*, Tübingen 1913;
Adolf SCHLATTER: *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, Stuttgart 1952;
Anders NYGREN: *Der Römerbrief*, Göttingen 1951;
Otto MICHEL: *Der Brief an die Römer*, Göttingen 1955.
[2]) *a.a.O.* P 53.
[3]) *a.a.O.* P 42.
[4]) *a.a.O.* P 32.
[5]) *a.a.O.* P 7.
[6]) Dazu ist benutzt KITTEL, *ThWNT* Vol. I-VI, P 704, daneben W. BAUER 1937[3]

Paulus bezeichnet sich selbst als einen Schuldner [1]) der Griechen nd der Barbaren; [2]) dass damit die griechische und die nicht-riechische Welt unter Ausschluss der Judenschaft gemeint ist, ürfte kaum bestritten werden können. Neben den Griechen und en Barbaren wird die Judenschaft als tertium genus betrachtet. hne Frage bewegte sich auch Paulus in dieser Gedankenwelt. In om wird es um die Begegnung mit Leuten gehen, die in steigen-em Masse in den Wirkungsbereich der Griechen eingetreten sind, ber die Pläne des Apostels reichen ja über diese die herrschende ultur repräsentierenden Griechen und Römer hinaus auf die noch ls Barbaren angesehenen Spanier, Gallier und Germanen [3]) hin, lso auf die nichtgriechische Welt. In der in dieser Welt gültigen Veise scheidet er nun zwischen Weisen und Ungebildeten. Diese Velt wird er in Rom vorfinden, sie redet er an: Ich möchte auch uch in Rom das Evangelium predigen. Er redet damit eine in Rom vorhandene Gemeinde [4]) an, Leute also, die einen Kontakt nit der christlichen Botschaft gehabt haben. Diese Anrede aber iat eine bestimmte Absicht: Εὐαγγελίσασθαι! Bei diesem Wort ist u beachten, dass Paulus, wenn er von der eigenen Predigt allein pricht, immer nur dieses Wort gebraucht. [5]) Jede andere, auch lie eigene Predigt einschliessende Verkündigung heisst κηρύσσειν. Benutzt Paulus nun hier dieses die eigene Predigt allein meinende Wort, dann spricht eine polemische Absicht [6]) mit, in der jene an-egriffen und zurückgewiesen werden, die in der christlichen Bot-chaft zuerst ein neues Ethos und nicht an der entscheidenden Stelle das neue Leben sehen, die also aus dem Evangelium ein ieues Gesetz machen. Behält man das im Auge, dann erhält ὀφειλέτης einen besonderen Klang, zugleich wird auch klar, warum ur von den Griechen und Barbaren die Rede ist, also das tertium enus, die Judenschaft ungenannt bleibt. Schuldner-sein meint

[1]) Hauck in *ThWNT* V, 565 „So weiss sich Paulus, der einstige Verfolger des Evangeliums, seit seiner Begnadigung und Berufung durch Christus zum Botschafter an der ganzen Menschheit verpflichtet."

[2]) Windisch in *ThNWT* I, 551 „Paulus verwendet . . . im ganzen so wie Philo und Josephus, auch in dem Sinne, dass er den Ἰουδαῖος bewusst nicht einbezieht. . . ."

[3]) Windisch *a.a.O.* P 549/50.

[4]) Dazu vergl. Oscar Cullmann, *Petrus*, Zürich 1952, P 82 ff.

[5]) Friedrich in *ThWNT* II, 705 ff, bes. 716 ff, allerdings ohne die hier behauptete spezielle Verwendung.

[6]) Zu dem polemischen Absichten neben den Kommentaren auch Cullmann.

nicht nur, dass er die Botschaft weiterzugeben schuldig wäre es ist vielmehr daran gedacht, dass der Apostel sich selbst der griechischen und nichtgriechischen Welt schuldig [1]) ist, weil in seiner Existenz, nicht bloss in seinem Ethos das grundlegend alles wandelnde Ereignis geschehen ist. Die Judenschaft will von dieser neuen Schöpfung unter keinen Umständen wissen, weil sie ihre von der Welt getrennte Existenz in dem ihr Leben regelnden Gesetz zu haben meinte. [2]) Im Wissen von dieser im Leben des Apostels so entscheidenden Feindschaft der Juden begreift man erst ganz, warum er nur von den Griechen und Barbaren redet und welch ein Schmerz es ihm ist, so reden zu müssen, wird im weiteren Verlauf des Briefes nur zu deutlich. [3])

Auf diesem Hintergrunde ist nun der Satz zu sehen: οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. [4]) Eine Verknüpfung von v 14 mit v 16 ist nun gekünstelt; der Apostel hat es zwar mit einer Kulturwelt zu tun, die die übrige Welt in steigendem Masse beeinflusst und formt, sodass auch sie sich mit Stolz hellenistisch nennt; aber er hat es auch mit der Judenschaft zu tun. Ihnen, den Kultivierten und den Wilden, ist er sich selbst schuldig, und zwar als einer, dem die neue Schöpfung widerfahren ist, dem also nicht bloss ein neues Ethos anvertraut wurde. Sich des Evangeliums nicht schämen, sich dazu zu bekennen, [5]) das meint doch hier, sich der alten Existenz schämen und die neue Existenz stolz bekennen. Unter dem Evangelium von der Gnade, von der vergebenden Liebe, kann der Apostel es ertragen, dass er in seinem besten Bemühn eine Totgeburt [6]) war, ein Feind Gottes und seiner Gemeinde. [7]) Denn das gehört zum Wesen der neuen Schöpfung, dass die alte in ihrem ganzen Wesen, in ihrer Todesverfallenheit, in dem Ausmass der Schuld,

---

[1]) Vergl. dazu Äusserungen wie Philp ii 17, die auf die Bereitschaft zum Martyrium zielen.

[2]) Vergl. dazu Strack Billerbeck, *Matthäus*, München 1956, P 250 ff.

[3]) Bes. Röm. x.

[4]) Bultmann in *ThWNT* I, 188 ff, Michel *a.a.O.* P 42: „'Sich nicht schämen' ist eine negative Formulierung für das positive Ereignis des 'Bekennens' in einer bestimmten geschichtlichen Situation der Anfechtung. . . Pls betont, dass er dem Ärgernis des Evangeliums in Rom nicht ausweichen will. Es geht hier nicht um das Fehlen einer psychologischen Scheu . . ., sondern um eine konkrete Bereitschaft, um einen in Worte gefassten Entschluss und um ein feststellbares Ereignis."

[5]) Vergl. bes. Michel *a.a.O.* P 42 f.

[6]) 1. Kor. xv 8, vergl. des Verfassers „Gnade — das entscheidende Wort," *NT*, Brill, Vol. II, Fasc. 3-4, 1958, P 281 ff.

[7]) 1. Kor. xv 9.

ie nicht in Verhängnis oder gelegentlichen Irrtum verharmlost erden kann, erkannt und als unentschuldbar bekannt wird. Der on der Gnade [1]) in der neuen Schöpfung eingehüllte Mensch raucht nun nicht nach Entschuldungsverfahren zu suchen, er kann n seiner Schuld — auch in dem besten Leben und den grossartigsten emühungen — Ja sagen. Denn das stösst ja die Judenschaft urück, dass sie aus ihrer Leistung kein Verdienst abzuleiten ermag. [2])

Weil das gilt, darum kann der Apostel in zwei Sätzen, die mit άρ anheben, sagen, warum er sich des Evangeliums nicht zu chämen braucht, obwohl es zuerst seine alte Existenz in ihrer ollständigen Nichtigkeit enthüllte und dem daran Zerbrechenden ie rettende Gnade und vergebende Liebe zusagt.

1. δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Bei ύναμις [3]) wird sorgsam darauf zu achten sein, dass die Griechen aneben mindestens zwei andere Worte haben, einmal κρᾶτος von er öffentlichen Macht und zum anderen ἰσχύς von der körperlichen raft des Menschen. Das hier vorliegende Wort meint also im Unterchied von der öffentlichen und der körperlichen Anstrengung des Menschen die diesen überwältigende Kraft Gottes. Evangelium ist lso nicht ein neues Ethos, nicht die Herausforderung des Menschen n seiner kollektiven oder persönlichen moralischen Existenz, ondern meint den überwältigenden, erneuernden Zugriff Gottes am Menschen, sodass aus dem alten Adam der neue Mensch, aus dem ünder der Begnadigte, aus dem im Zorn Gottes Wahrheit in Unrecht verkehrenden Menschen der das Evangelium bekennende ird. [4])

Dieses Widerfahrnis geschieht Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι. Hier ist nun vom Juden die Rede, wobei zu beachten ist, dass hier n Singular gesprochen wird, während in v 14 von den Griechen nd den Barbaren im Plural im Sinne eines alle umfassenden nspruchs die Rede war, unter den sich der Apostel als Schuldner

[1]) 2. Kor. xii 9.

[2]) Röm. iii 21 ff.

[3]) Zu den drei Begriffen vergl. GRUNDMANN, *ThWNT* II, 286 ff; MICHAELIS *bd* III, 905 ff; GRUNDMANN *ebd* III, 400 ff.

[4]) Vergl. vielfache Äusserungen des Paulus; hier steht hinter dem Satz om Evangelium als Gotteskraft zur Rettung unausgesprochen der Satz, ass des Menschen Kraft und Bemühung nicht zur Rettung führt. Der Iensch muss sich also schämen, wenn ihm offenbar wird, dass er sein Heil ei sich selbst erwartete, während es ihm doch nur aus Gnade zuteil werden ann.

der ganzen nichtjüdischen Welt gestellt sah. Meint das Zahlwor „eine faktisch wertlose Concession an das auserwählte Volk Gottes' nach LIETZMANN? [1]) Oder ist daran zu denken, wie SCHLATTER will, [2]) dass Paulus immer zuerst zu den Juden und erst dann zu den Griechen ging? Oder soll an den „Vorsprung, nicht den Vorrang" der Juden gedacht sein, so mit Barth MICHEL? [3]) Sicher dürfte sein, dass Paulus nicht an eine Wertskala dachte, wie sie den Juden vorschwebte, sondern an eine Reihenfolge, in der dem Juden die erste Stufe, die erste Nummer eingeräumt wurde [4]). In der neuen Schöpfung ist zuerst der jüdischen Welt offenbar gemacht worden, dass Gotteskraft zur Rettung gehört und nicht menschliche Kraft, weder die öffentliche noch die persönliche Kraft des Menschen reichen dazu hin. Was dem Juden — hier meint in dem ganzen Zusammenhang eindeutig Paulus sich selbst [5]) — zuerst aufging, das soll auch dem Hellenen widerfahren, der so stolz alle Welt in seine kulturelle Leistung einbezieht, nach der der Barbar selbst strebt. Und weil der Apostel im Evangelium neue Existenz in der Gotteskraft zur Rettung erhalten hatte, wurde er Schuldner der ganzen anderen Welt, nachdem die Juden sich dieser Botschaft entzogen hatten.

2. δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. Auch mit diesem Satze will der Apostel sagen, warum er sich des Evangeliums nicht zu schämen braucht. Von hier aus wird auch in der Regel ἐν αὐτῷ dahin verstanden, dass das Evangelium gemeint wäre. MICHEL: [6]) „Im Evangelium wird apokalyptisch offenbar"; NYGREN: [7]) „Gottes Gerechtigkeit ist eine ... im Evangelium offenbarte"; so auch SCHLATTER, [8]) während LIETZMANN [9]) es

---

[1]) *a.a.O.* P 7. [2]) *a.a.O.* P 33 f. [3]) *a.a.O.* P 44 f.

[4]) Paulus scheint eine Reihenfolge, nicht einen Vorrang bei der Benutzung des Zahlwortes im Auge zu haben, vergl. auch des Verfassers Ausführungen zu 1. Kor. xv 1-11, bes zu v 3 und v 8.

[5]) Vielleicht ist auch daran zu denken, dass die den Einzelnen meinende Anrede Gottes die Verwendung des Singular empfiehlt, während in der Predigt der Apostel die Gemeinde angeredet ist, eine Mehrzahl.

[6]) *a.a.O.* P 45 unten. [7]) *a.a.O.* P 62. [8]) *a.a.O.* P 39.

SCHLATTER's Satz „Der Wirker der Offenbarung Gottes ist aber nicht der Glaubende, sondern die Botschaft, das göttliche Wort, das dem Menschen den Glauben gibt" ist kein durchschlagendes Argument gegen die hier vorgetragene Lösung; denn das wird ja nicht gesagt, es geht vielmehr darum, dass Gott seine Gerechtigkeit an seinem Partner, dem in der Gotteskraft geretteten Menschen kundtut, um aus dem Glauben des Geretteten andere zu dem wahren Glauben zu führen.

[9]) *a.a.O.* P 7 f.

bergeht. Wenn aber beachtet wird, dass zwei koordinierte Sätze
ngeben sollen, warum sich der Apostel des Evangeliums nicht zu
hämen braucht, Sätze, die zudem parallel gebaut sind, dann
ürfte im zweiten Satze nicht auf einmal eine Notwendigkeit
estehen, auf das Evangelium gesondert zu verweisen. Darum
ird mit ἐν αὐτῷ wohl auf πιστεύοντι Bezug genommen sein.
n Gläubigen wird die Gerechtigkeit Gottes offenbar. Wie mit
raft Gottes in v 16 die Gott eigene Kraft gemeint ist, und wie
aglos mit dem Zorn Gottes in v 18 der Gott eigene Zorn gemeint
t, so ist auch hier die Gott eigene Gerechtigkeit gemeint. [1]) Aber
ie die Gotteskraft nicht bei sich selbst bleibt, sondern dem Gläubi-
en zum Heil wird, und wie der Zorn Gottes sich am Partner aus-
irkt, so ist es auch mit der Gerechtigkeit Gottes: Sie ist nicht
ie in sich ruhende Qualität Gottes, sondern kennzeichnet sein
Handeln mit seinem Partner, dem Menschen. [2]) Die Gerechtigkeit
ottes wird also nicht in einem Codex oder einem codificierten
echt offenbar, sondern ist ein Widerfahrnis am Menschen, der
um Glauben gelangt, dem Gotteskraft zum Heil verholfen hat.
nd weil dem Menschen dies geschah, weil in ihm der eigentliche
otteswille offenbar wird, darum wird der im Glauben erneuerte
Mensch ein Schuldner der ganzen Welt, damit dies in seinem
eben offenbar gewordene Geschehnis auch den Anderen wider-
ahren kann. Darum schliesst dieser Satz mit der Wendung: Aus
lauben zum Glauben. Das ist keine rhetorische Phrase, [3]) sondern
eigt, was neue Existenz bedeutet: Aus deinem Glauben, du neuer
Mensch, gelangt deine dir anvertraute Welt [4]) zum Glauben. Denn
er neue Mensch lebt ja nun nicht mehr nur sich selbst, vegetiert
a nun nicht mehr in der Todesverfallenheit, sondern lebt aus dem
lauben, [5]) der im Evangelium Gottes Kraft zum Heil empfing.
Glaube meint immer einen neuen Gehorsam und eine neue Hoff-
ung [6]) zugleich und entspricht insofern dem im Wort ergehenden

[1]) Dazu bes SCHLATTER P 36.
[2]) Dazu ist auch v 18 zu vergleichen. Der Mensch ist als Partner Gottes
eschaffen, ist zu seiner Beschämung gefallen und trotzdem begnadigt.
[3]) LIETZMANN *a.a.O.* P 7 unten.
[4]) Auf dieser Gewissheit ruht etwa 1. Kor. vii 14.
[5]) Das AT-liche Citat wird erst voll verstanden, wenn man seine Umkeh-
rung bedenkt: Der Ungerechte, aus dem Unglauben wird er sterben. Der
Ungerechte, der im Ungehorsam gegen Gott seinen eigenen Weg zum eigenen
Vorteil geht, verfehlt das Leben und versinkt in Einsamkeit. Leben meint
miteinanderleben aus der Teilhabe an der Gotteskraft.
[6]) Vergl. BULTMANN WEISER in *ThWNT* VI, P 174 ff bes. 218 ff.

Anspruch und Zuspruch. Wer das Wort als Gesetz [1]) verkürzt verkürzt auch den Glauben und entsprechend die Predigt. Von der anderen Möglichkeit einer Verkürzung [2]) braucht hier nicht die Rede zu sein.

Diese Ausführungen machen klar, dass bei Paulus in einer oft nicht zureichend bedachten Weise die eigene Existenz stets mitbedacht ist; dass es nie um eine theoretische Erörterung geht, bei der Paulus unbeteiligt daneben stünde. [3]) Überall ist der heisse Atem des Mannes [4]) zu spüren, der die umfassende Erneuerung in der Neuschöpfung erfahren hat, von der er nun aller Welt unverkürzt im Bedenken dieser ganzen Welt mit ihren Problemen predigt. Nicht eine panegyrische Rhetorik [5]) treibt diesen Mann, sondern das atemberaubende Widerfahrnis: Meine alte Welt, und das heisst ja immer Israel, das Gottesvolk, die höchstmögliche Frömmigkeit, ist vergangen; der Eifer um die eigene Leistung macht Gottesfeinde, aber Gottes Kraft ist mächtiger, seine Nähe erbarmt sich auch über diese. Nur wo dies bedacht ist, sind zureichende Sicherungen aufgerichtet gegen das Missverständnis der Predigt des Paulus als der Rede von einem neuen Ethos. [6])

Bei der Auslegung dieses Textes sind also folgende Punkte zu beachten:

1. Der Charakter eines feierlichen Bekenntnisses in dieser Aussage: Ich schäme mich des Evangeliums nicht, und zwar:

a. weil es dem Gläubigen Gotteskraft zum Heil ist;

b. weil im Gläubigen Gottes Gerechtigkeit aus Glauben zum Glauben offenbar wird. [7])

2. Der polemische Ton denen gegenüber, die sich des Evangeliums schämen als eine Torheit und ein Ärgernis, wenn auch dieser Ton nicht über Gebühr hervorgehoben werden darf.

3. Die Scham des Apostels über sein Leben als Verfolger der Gemeinde um der einst praktizierten gesetzlichen Frömmigkeit willen.

---

[1]) Des Paulus Kampf gegen die Judaisten.

[2]) Des Paulus Kampf gegen jede Schwärmerei.

[3]) Vergl. dazu die Erörterungen über das Gesetz.

[4]) Wie beteiligt Paulus immer ist, wird am deutlichsten dort, wo er seine eigene Vergangenheit als Feind der Gemeinde berührt.

[5]) Der Wortreichtum vieler Stellen erklärt sich nicht als Rhetorik, sondern als stammelndes Bemühen, von der neuen Existenz in vollem Umfange und unverkürzt Zeugnis zu geben.

[6]) Das wird besonders zu beachten sein bei den paraenetischen Texten, auch Röm. xii ff.

[7]) Dazu auch Röm. x 17.